

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE first article in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for January is a review by Professor Sanday of the 'Cambridge Biblical Essays' (Macmillan; 12s. net). That volume was noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES immediately after its issue. And a continued use of it has deepened the impression then conveyed that it is a book of the first importance.

---

The importance of the book does not lie in the additions which it makes to our knowledge of the Bible. It does not make many additions. That was not the purpose, we may be sure, for which the book was planned and prepared; it is certainly not the end that has been attained. We are always glad of the least addition to our knowledge of the contents of the Bible or even of its surroundings. But we have more occasion for gladness when men whom we can trust tell us how to value and how to use the abundant knowledge which we already possess.

---

There is Dr. Johns, for example, whose article is on the 'Influence of Babylonian Mythology upon the Old Testament.' We know a great deal now about Babylonian mythology. We have read and written not a little about its influence upon the Old Testament. But what is it all worth? What use can we make of it? This is just what Dr. Johns tells us. This is just what

Professor Sanday finds to be 'the most interesting feature in the essay.'

---

For we no longer need the evidence of the monuments to prove that the Bible is true. It is long since we have seen that the monuments are more in need of the support of the Bible than the Bible of the monuments. Even Professor Sayce told us years ago that 'the Assyrian kings are brazen-faced liars on their monuments.' What we want to know now is the religious value of the early narratives of Genesis.

---

Well, in order to obtain that knowledge, we must set the early narratives of the Bible beside the early mythology of the Babylonians. And not of the Babylonians only. Nor only of those races which are in closest geographical proximity to the Hebrews. If the Babylonian mythology serves the purpose best, it will be because it is best known, not because it is nearest. What we need, in short, is just what Dr. Johns gives us here—in the words of Dr. Sanday, 'a sympathetic, and therefore (as I conceive) really intelligent treatment, of the early mythologies.'

---

Our first mistake was to go to the monuments for evidence of the truth of the Bible. That was excessive humility on our part. For the Bible is its own evidence; otherwise it could not possibly



be the Bible. But we made a greater mistake than that. We went to the monuments to prove our own interpretation of the Bible. And that was as excessive arrogance. The monuments have not supported our interpretation. They have shown us that it was a mistaken interpretation. And we have sometimes been led to revise our interpretation; and sometimes we have simply been disappointed. Dr. Johns goes to the monuments in order that by their aid he may understand what the Bible really is. He lays the Babylonian texts by the side of the Hebrew texts that the one may interpret the other, and that out of the comparison he may understand how much is truth and how much is only vehicle, how much is primitive and accidental and how much is eternal.

---

Professor Sanday quotes considerable portions of Dr. Johns' paper, and some of it he throws into italics. He is evidently anxious, like the rest of us, to get at the back of that word 'myth.' For we speak freely enough of the mythology of Babylonia, but we scarcely dare use the word myth in relation to Israel. If the question were asked, Is the Fall a myth? we should call it another way of asking, Is the Fall a lie? But what is a myth? '*Many so-called myths,*' says Dr. Johns (and Dr. Sanday throws the two sentences into approving italics), '*are primitive attempts to put an hypothesis into words before language has become sufficiently developed for scientific terms to be available. Recourse is invariably had to metaphor.*'

---

Dr. Johns takes the example of an eclipse. There is good reason to suppose that the Babylonians knew what caused an eclipse, though they may not have known just how the moon got between us and the sun. When, therefore, they said that a dragon had devoured the sun, 'they could not (Dr. Sanday again uses italics) have believed in the actual existence of a dragon, even if their fathers and some ignorant folk among them still did so.'

Pass to the sixth essay in the volume. Its title is 'Rabbinic Aids to Exegesis.' Its author is Mr. Israel Abrahams, University Reader in Talmudic and Rabbinic Literature. Here the ignorance of the average Gentile is so great that the addition of actual information may be considerable. But that is not why Dr. Sanday pronounces this essay to be one of the most interesting and valuable in the book. It is because it marks an advance in method in the branch of study which it commends. 'Until a comparatively recent date,' says Dr. Sanday, 'prejudice has been too much at work on both sides. Christian scholars have either unduly ignored the assistance which Rabbinic literature might have given them, or else they have collected such data as they could chiefly for polemical purposes. And, on the other hand, Jewish scholars have retaliated in the same polemical spirit.' Mr. Abrahams' article is the same sort of contribution as we have already had from Dr. Johns. The recognition of priority in time on the part of some Jewish Rabbi does not make a great gospel text superfluous or untrue. Bring the Jewish Rabbi's saying into comparison sympathetically. The saying itself may obtain a wider meaning and a deeper, and Christ may be better understood—understood to be the Christ of the Jews as well as of the Gentiles.

---

There is one thing in this volume which distinguishes it from the previous volume of 'Theological Essays,' which was published in 1905. The contributors to the 'Theological Essays' were members of the English Church, and all but one were of the clergy. The present book, on the other hand, 'contains essays by members of several religious bodies, and among the essayists are five laymen.' Professor Sanday likes that. And when he reaches the eleventh essay on Jesus and Paul, which is written by Professor Anderson Scott of Westminster (Presbyterian) College, it is evidently a particular pleasure to him to find it so good, and to be able to say that it is 'a really helpful contribution, grappling with the subject at closer quarters and more along its whole breadth than



anything that I remember to have seen upon it in English.' But the next essay is by Professor Percy Gardner, and it is no surprise to find Dr. Sanday arrested there.

For Professor Percy Gardner is a most difficult writer to deal with. He is so fair, and yet so unfair. He makes so many concessions that it seems ungracious to grudge him his own little individualities. And yet these individualities, with all the sweetness of their expression, are really enough to carry away the foundation upon which rests the whole gospel of the grace of God.

Dr. Sanday has always been gentle with Professor Percy Gardner. He is gentle here. We are not quite sure that he would be so gentle if he realized how little of the historical in the New Testament Professor Gardner really leaves with us. Even here, where the subject is the Speeches of St. Paul in Acts, so much is taken away of the speeches at Lystra and at Athens that Dr. Sanday is constrained to enter an emphatic protest. But he passes from it, to notice, with unmistakable pleasure, an incidental paragraph on the subject of inspiration, and to say that 'the essay would have been well worth publishing if it had contained nothing else.'

This is the paragraph: 'From the present point of view the question of inspiration or non-inspiration of a book is not primary. For how does divine inspiration act upon a writer? In two ways: first, by strengthening and intensifying his natural powers; and second, by producing in him what W. James has called an uprush of the sub-conscious. I should prefer to call the last an inrush of the super-conscious. It makes a man a vehicle of deep-lying forces, so that he builds better than he knows. He may think that he is writing for a society, or even for an individual, when he is really writing for future ages, and to meet needs of which he is unconscious.'

That is the paragraph. What does Professor Sanday say about it? He says: 'The appeal to

the sub-conscious is, I venture to think, fraught with great promise, not only in this, but in many other directions. It happens, by a coincidence, that I am myself having recourse to it for another purpose at the present time. But on this subject of inspiration, I fully believe, with Dr. Gardner, that it opens out new vistas; and I am very grateful to him for the form which he has given to his statement.'

The last essay in the book is by its editor, Professor Swete. It is an essay on the religious value of the Bible. It is not a summary or criticism of the contents of all the essays that have gone before. The essayists were allowed to write in their own way, and the essays are allowed to stand on their own merits. But it expresses the spirit of the book; and if it had been found at the beginning it would have been a useful lead to the understanding of the great gift which these Cambridge scholars have given us.

Dr. Sanday is delighted with it. It 'breathes all the *mitis sapientia* of Dr. Swete.' It is 'not only characteristic of its author, but it may be said to be also characteristic of the present day and of the book as a whole. It shows that wide tolerance and open-minded recognition of good from all sides which marks the age to which we belong.'

Then Professor Sanday quotes this paragraph: 'The Gospels exhibit this pattern, and it is this which gives them a religious value that even in the Bible itself is unique. No criticism, whether of the sources of the Gospels or of their historical details, can greatly affect their value in this respect. It is independent of our acceptance of the miracles. That it can even survive an abandonment of the Catholic Doctrine of the Person of Christ, or a refusal to analyze the impression which the Gospels convey upon that subject, may be seen from the earlier lectures of Adolf Harnack's *What is Christianity?* No more enthusiastic appreciation of the religious value of the Gospel life of Jesus can be found than in that remarkable book, which is



nevertheless written from the standpoint of a Christology that can satisfy no Catholic Christian.'

Professor Sanday, we say, quotes that paragraph, and he asks: 'Would it have been written so lately as ten years ago, even by Dr. Swete?' But it has been written now. It has been written by Professor Swete of Cambridge, and Professor Sanday of Oxford agrees with it. 'That is the temper of Cambridge; and it is also the temper of Oxford, and (I think I may add) of enlightened opinion in this country generally. We do not intend to let the anchor drag loose from our own moorings; but we do intend to welcome that which is good, from whatever quarter it may come; and we shall judge those who differ from us, not merely on party lines, but on the extent to which the opinions which they express commend themselves to reason and conscience.'

Professor Cheyne has sent to the *Christian Commonwealth* of February 16 a review of Mr. Claude Montefiore's *Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*. It is a review of four great columns in length. For the book appeals to him. He looks at our Lord with something of the same admiring detachment of mind as that with which He is regarded by Mr. Montefiore, and he is pleased with Mr. Montefiore because Mr. Montefiore the Jew is so well pleased with Jesus.

Professor Cheyne is 'not offended either at an occasional unfavourable criticism of sayings of the Master or at a frank recognition of imaginative elements in the Gospels.' It is true that Mr. Montefiore is a Jew, and 'a fervent Jew.' He does not believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and he does not believe that He is the Messiah. But what of that? 'If Jesus was really more perfectly man than we were taught to suppose, and if He has been more absolutely identified with one of God's "countenances" (to speak in Semitic fashion) than is justifiable by the ascertainable facts, need we feel our Christianity imperilled?'

The book appeals to him, even to the length of its *a priori* canons of criticism. Mr. Montefiore cautions us against supposing that a given passage is authentic in proportion to the age of the 'source' which records it. Dr. Cheyne agrees. And he agrees when Mr. Montefiore says that the point is, where would tradition remember truly, and where would it consciously or unconsciously add, alter, and embroider? It is a pity he does not tell us how we are to know what tradition would be likely to do.

Again, Mr. Montefiore warns us against 'the illusory canon' that the noblest and most original sayings must be authentic, as being worthy of none but Jesus. And again Professor Cheyne agrees. 'One of the noblest,' says Mr. Montefiore, 'is surely, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do" (Lk 23<sup>34</sup>). And yet this is almost certainly not authentic.' Now it is a remarkable circumstance that Westcott and Hort, who knew quite as well as Montefiore and Cheyne how the external evidence stands, while coming to the conclusion that this saying did not originally belong to St. Luke's Gospel, are nevertheless quite emphatic about its being an authentic saying of Jesus. Their words are: 'Few verses of the Gospels bear in themselves a surer witness to the truth of what they record than this first of the Words from the Cross.' In short, they simply accept 'the illusory canon' that the noblest and most original sayings must be authentic as being worthy of none but Jesus.

But if Professor Cheyne is pleased with Mr. Montefiore's *Commentary*, he is most of all pleased with it when the author undertakes the emendation of the Gospel text. There are two passages which he particularly commends.

The first is Lk 11<sup>41</sup>. The literal translation is, 'Give for alms the things that are in it, and behold all things are clean unto you.' That, says Professor Cheyne, is impossible. He goes back with Mr. Montefiore to the Aramaic. In Aramaic *sakki*



means 'give alms,' and *dakki* means 'cleanse.' Read, therefore, 'Cleanse what is within, and surely all is clean to you.'

The other passage is the Parable of the Good Samaritan. It is a parable that has been misnamed. There is no Samaritan in it. Following the great Jewish scholar J. Halévy, Mr. Montefiore says that the Samaritan was not a Samaritan, but an Israelite. 'Priest, Levite, and Samaritan,' he says, 'is no less queer and impossible than Priest, Deacon, and Frenchman would be to us to-day. Most probably the alteration was simply due to the uncomprehendingness of Gentile Christians, who did not know that "Israelite" was commonly used for a man who was neither Priest nor Levite.' Professor Cheyne cannot say whether the alteration was deliberate or accidental. He is quite sure it is an alteration.

But beyond his pleasure in the Commentary, and beyond his delight in the textual criticism, Professor Cheyne approves of the book because of the 'reverent admiration' which Mr. Montefiore feels for Jesus. He quotes two passages. 'The love of Jesus for children must have been a historic and characteristic trait. He must have been one of the most sympathetic and human of men.' That is the one passage. And this is the other: 'How much strength has not the prayer at Gethsemane given to endless human souls! And why should it not, even though for us Jesus is neither God nor Messiah, give strength to Jewish hearts also? We must restore this hero to the bead-roll of our heroes.'

One of the Assistant Masters at Harrow has translated and edited the work entitled *Jéhovah* of Professor Westphal of Montauban, and he has persuaded Dr. Ryle to write a foreword. Dr. Ryle is now a bishop. He has been a bishop for a good many years. But there was a time when he was the strongest Old Testament teacher in Cambridge, and this foreword shows that he has

still the teacher's instinct for the instruction that has life in it.

What Dr. Ryle was in Cambridge has been told by Professor James Hope Moulton in an article 'About Some Teachers' in the *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* for February. Dr. Moulton says: 'By far the greatest power in the University in my time on the religious side was Professor Herbert Ryle. Lucid and learned, fearlessly progressive but deeply reverent, Professor Ryle's teaching was among the best I ever knew. He was extremely popular and influential with the men, and seemed to have reached an ideal sphere when they made him Head of a "House." Why, oh why did the authorities insist on his taking up a hereditary position on the bench of bishops?'

But we say, and in spite of that wail, it is evident that the Bishop of Winchester has not lost his interest in the Old Testament. For the book to which he has written this foreword—it is called in English *The Law and the Prophets* (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net)—is a book which no man would give his name to unless he approved of it, and no man would approve of it who had not been moving forward with the progress of Old Testament study.

For Professor Westphal is not simply a follower of Wellhausen. Far as he is removed from the traditional reader who takes the books of the Old Testament in their familiar order, and squares the ethics of Judges with that of Isaiah, he is as far removed from the popular critic of the moment who calls the opening chapters of Genesis fragments of Babylonian mythology, denies the existence of the patriarchs, and discovers Jehovah in the neighbourhood of Mount Sinai—a little local deity worshipped by some Kenite tribe. And it is not that he is simply a conservative critic. It is not that he simply occupies a middle position. Let us touch the three topics just mentioned. And let us take them up in their inverse order.

The first, then, is the origin of Jehovah the God



of Israel. The most popular belief at present is that Moses and the Israelites found Him at Sinai, a God worshipped by some nomad tribes accustomed to encamp there. Professor Westphal does not believe it. If the Israelites came to Sinai, they came there under the protection of a God of some kind, and with some name to be known by. Now there is no case in history, he says, of a nation abandoning their own God and accepting the God of another nation simply because He made Himself terrible by means of 'a few claps of thunder.' And how is He said to have recommended Himself? By chastising them. 'The peculiarity of Jehovah, from His first appearance, is to command, and to strike mercilessly when disobeyed'—a strange début, says Professor Westphal, for a deity who, without any previous record, sought to supplant the old teraphim of Israel.

'But if, on the contrary'—and we shall quote Professor Westphal's exact words now—'under the new and suggestive name given Him by Moses' reformation, He is the same ancestral God whose blessings are bound up with the life of the Hebrew patriarchs, and if, in the events of a supreme crisis, He has just shown Himself the deliverer of the tribes which call upon Him, then everything becomes clear and intelligible.'

The next thing is the existence of the patriarchs. Jehovah is represented as saying, 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.' This is said to have been the credentials with which Moses was sent down into Egypt. Well, if Moses ever was sent into Egypt, and if he did deliver the Israelites, what other credentials had he? What other explanation is there of the authority he obtained over the Israelites? Just as the reforms of Moses are necessary to the understanding of the prophets, so, says Professor Westphal, historical continuity requires the nomad life of the patriarchs, the distress of the descendants of Abraham, and the miraculous deliverance of the Exodus, to account for the authority of Moses and

the building of the national constitution on the Law (the Torah) of Jehovah.

There remain the early narratives of Genesis, the first eleven chapters, which seem to have no connexion with the history of the Hebrews, and are said to contain traditions which are common to all the Semitic nations. Is it a mere literary accident that has linked these traditions to the call of Abraham? And is it a scientific duty to let them sink back again into the common heap of Oriental myths? Professor Westphal thinks our duty lies elsewhere.

For, in the first place, it is a fact that no Semitic religion contains all the traditions recorded in the early chapters of Genesis. Nowhere else are they grouped in the same way, and nowhere else is any one of them found described with the same fulness or precision. In the next place, the call of Abraham is unintelligible without them. Says Professor Westphal, 'If the Bible story began with the call of Abraham, the drama of salvation, of which the history of the patriarchs is the first act, would open without anything to explain its subject, or to interest us in the plot, and the later acts would leave the riddle still unsolved. "God said (what God?) to Abraham (who is that?), in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed" (what is the meaning of that?). Re-read the opening pages of Genesis and everything is accounted for. What was reputed a handful of Semitic traditions, unconnected with the history of Israel, becomes the forecourt of the temple where God waits to teach and redeem humanity.'

The last thing is that Professor Westphal does not attempt to square the ethics of the Book of Judges with the ethics of the Book of Isaiah. He does not believe that 'the whole of Revelation was completely contained in each successive moment of its history. This, he holds, is a common but most regrettable error of writers of Bible Histories. They strive to demonstrate the scientific accuracy of the account of the Creation, 'as if the men who



wrote it had known the theories of Galileo and of Darwin.' If the subject is the religion of Abraham, they attribute to him the monotheism of Moses, as if God had never needed to say to Moses, 'Hear, O Israel, thy God is the only God there is.' In the stories of Jephthah, Samuel, or Elisha, everywhere and always we assume that the men of the Old Testament were, from the outset, all equally acquainted with the moral and religious content of the revelation preached by an Isaiah or a Jeremiah, if not even by Jesus Christ and St. Paul.

Professor Westphal calls this historical heresy. In art it would be called a lack of perspective. It would recall the paintings of the earliest masters, of Cranach or of Albert Dürer. And what is the

effect of it? Its effect is to suggest that men who behave at times like the uttermost barbarians have been taught all the will of the just and holy God, and have even been commanded to behave thus barbarously. Professor Westphal takes the revelation of God in the Bible as historical and progressive. And he takes these words loyally and courageously in the fulness of their meaning. He tells his pupils that in the early stages of Bible history there was not a direct, immediate, and adequate revelation of the true God, but an indirect and educational revelation, which was to the true knowledge of God, as the shadow of blessings to come, to use a Biblical phrase, is to the glorious light of Christ, or as the milk which children enjoy is to the meat which only the adult can digest.

## The Authorities for the Institution of the Eucharist.

BY PROFESSOR SIR W. M. RAMSAY, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L., ABERDEEN.

### PART II.

IV. (*continued*). This incidental allusion to the true nature of the Eucharist in 1 Co 10<sup>16-21</sup>, therefore, must not be read as if it were a formal description according to the conditions of time and sequence. It is an exposition of truth, into which time does not enter. Paul shows what is the real meaning of the Church ceremony (which he understands as being familiarly known to the Corinthians), partly by direct interpretation, and partly by contrast with the rites of pagan dæmonic powers, rites which had an outward similarity to the Christian rite, but which were absolutely opposite in character and power. Nowhere does Paul show more clearly that he conceived the universe as a balance, more or less uneasy, between vast contending forces. The world around us cannot be understood, according to his view, as an inert mass: it is a war of tremendous powers, sweeping the life of man with them towards evil or towards good. In such a simple situation as the invitation given to a Corinthian Christian by some pagan friend are involved infinite possibilities and mighty forces of good and bad, of right and wrong. By participating in the pagan ceremonies, which

were a necessary accompaniment of every pagan feast, the Christian entered into a fellowship united through dæmonic powers, and was thereby repelled from the fellowship which is cemented by the Christian sacrament.

No one can read this passage intelligently without perceiving that Paul regarded the Eucharist not as a mere symbolic ceremony, but as a force of infinite potentiality in the life of man and in the constitution of the Church. So far as we can judge, Mark and Matthew regard the ceremony as teaching of important truth through parable; but the teaching is the prediction of the Saviour's death. They do not intimate any wider meaning in the acts and words; and they do not show any appreciation of force and driving power inherent in the due performance of the rite. To Paul the rite has far greater significance than we should gather from the narrative of Mark; and yet his opinion on this matter is seen only from his chap. 10, and would not readily be gathered from chap. 11, as we shall see.

We take *κοινωνία δαιμονίων* in the sense of 'a communion and fellowship (of men with one



another) united and cemented through dæmonic powers.' That, however, is not the meaning which most scholars take. It is a more common view to understand the *κοινωνία δαιμονίων* as 'the communion with dæmonic powers' (so, for example, Professor Gwatkin in his *Early Church History*, i. p. 268). Throughout the passage the genitive with *κοινωνία* seems to be used in the same sense. In 10<sup>16</sup> it is the fellowship and unity of the Brotherhood cemented through participation in the Cup and the Bread of the Eucharist. The Cup and the Bread are to Paul the fellowship of the Blood and the Body, *i.e.* the fellowship which is created and constituted through the Blood and the Body. He is speaking of forces and spiritual powers, not of material things. Those are the realities of life: the spirit is the true body: the material thing is merely outward appearance, the measure of man's ignorance, the existing proof of man's inability to discern the spiritual reality behind the external show. So again in 10<sup>18</sup>, 'They who eat the (Hebrew) sacrifices are a body of fellows of the Thysias-terion' ('altar,' R.V.), where there cannot be any doubt that Paul is describing the unity of the Hebrew race through their common relation to the Thysias-terion.

It is also clear that in Paul's estimation, just as every pagan feast was a rite fraught with vast potentialities of evil through the fellowship of dæmonic powers, so every common meal where several of the faithful were met together was a potential sacrament. There can be no thought of anniversaries or of recurrence on some special day or occasion in such an idea as he had. No connexion of the Sacrament with the Passover was possible in his mind: the Passover was an annual feast according to the Law: the Sacrament was a permanent factor, always existent, in the common life of the Brotherhood.

More formally and intentionally descriptive is the passage 1 Co 11<sup>20-30</sup>. Accordingly, inferences as to time and order are here permissible; and we observe that the Bread is first; it is a part of the meal; and after the meal was the Cup.<sup>1</sup> This expression 'after the supper' is quite conclusive as to the succession of the acts; and the same order appears also in vv. 26, 27, 28, 29, which are more allusive and therefore less decisive as evidence;

<sup>1</sup> Hence v. 20, 'When ye assemble . . . , it is not possible to eat the Lord's supper.' The main action causes the name. The Cup was a subsequent stage 'after the supper.'

the succession in them is determined by the succession previously stated in vv. 23-25.

We observe that Paul states the authority and sanction on which the Church rite is founded: the authority is that of the Lord Himself. The exact meaning of the words has been a subject of dispute: 'I received from the Lord that which also I delivered unto you.' This which he had received was the rite of the Bread and Wine, which he had taught the Corinthians to celebrate. Did Paul receive the knowledge direct from the Lord, or as handed down in the tradition from the Lord's lips?

The question was worth raising. It is inevitably raised by every one who reads the passage with an inquiring mind. Yet the answer cannot long be doubtful. If Paul claimed here to have received this knowledge direct from the Lord, he would be practically claiming to have founded the ceremony, and to have made the Church accept it, and to be the authority from whom the narrative, as it appears in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, was derived. How explain the universal acceptance by the Church? How explain the narratives of the Gospels, taken on credit from Paul and interpolated in the rest of the story which is derived from other authorities, and yet containing so many divergences from the one authority in regard to this ceremony. It is true that divergences occur in the different accounts of Paul's Conversion, all of which are founded ultimately on his authority; but those are divergences of a different kind. The only rational and the only possible explanation of the acceptance of the Eucharistic ceremony in all sections of the Church, even those hostile to Paul, is that it was handed down from the Lord.

Accordingly Paul means practically, 'I am only a link in the chain of tradition, reaching from the Lord at the Last Supper down to you.' The correlative terms which he uses, *παρέλαβον* and *παρέδωκα*, imply this. From his statement we must infer that the ceremony was practised by all Christians, that it was a necessary and universal part of the Christian religion, and that it was in existence from the beginning. Hence the words and the rite were familiar to all Christians in the ordinary service of the Church; and a revelation was not needed to communicate them to Paul. His point is not that he had a special revelation, but that the rite was fundamental and universal in Christianity; and in so far as he added anything on his own account (except simply to declare more



clearly the meaning of the words and acts), he detracted from the universality, and spoiled his own case.

Yet the theory has been seriously advanced that the command to repeat the rite as a ceremony of remembrance was unknown to the authors of the four Gospels, or was not believed by them to be genuine; that it was added by Paul on the authority of a private and special revelation made to him; and finally, that this command was interpolated in the text of Luke's Gospel. In proof of this latter part of the theory, it is pointed out that the Western text of Luke omits the command. On this theory we have to suppose that Paul seriously remodelled the sacred rite and gave it new meaning and greater importance. All such theories are inconsistent with the situation and the facts established by general consent.

Now let us carefully examine the account that Paul gives—professedly and intellectually the account of a rite long habitual in the Church, and coming down from the institution by the Lord. The very fact that it was universally familiar makes Paul's account brief, and prevents him from referring to it often in his letters. It was too well known to need emphasis or description. In writing to the Corinthians, these allusions to it are forced on him in the critical question of the right of Christians to participate in feasts at which pagan gods were honoured. Those gods were in themselves nought; but they barred the Christians who took part in their honour from the table of the Lord: 'Ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord and of the table of dæmonic beings.'

It is convenient to arrange the steps of the rite as Paul mentions them in the same way as those which Mark describes. We keep the same numbers, stating within square brackets those which Paul omits, and marking by an asterisk those which Paul mentions and which Mark omits. Where Paul describes in two stages an act which Mark sums up in one stage, or where Paul mentions one stage of an act of which Mark mentions only the other, we designate the two stages by the same number with the letters A and B.

1. He took bread.

2. He gave thanks (in Mark, He blessed it).

\*3A. He brake the bread.

[3B. omitted: He gave to the Twelve.]

4A. He said, 'This is my body' [Paul omits 'take'].

\*4B. 'Which is for you: this do in remembrance of me.'

5. The cup after supper: 'in like manner' implies 'he took.'

6. 'In like manner' implies 'he gave thanks.'

7. 'In like manner' implies 'he gave to the Twelve.'

[8. omitted (in Mark: 'they all drank': in Matthew and Luke the command to drink is given).]

9A. He said, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood.'

\*9B. 'This do, as oft as ye drink, in remembrance of me.'

[10. omitted: a prediction.]

In Paul's formal description of the rite as it was performed, two steps of the action, which Mark mentions, are omitted wholly: two are omitted partly: three are left to be inferred from the word 'in like manner.' Yet the sequence shows that there was no difference between the two recorders in regard to the acts: the omitted steps can be inferred from those which are mentioned. So the fact that all the disciples ate of the bread is not mentioned either by Mark or by Paul, yet it can be inferred from the details that they mention; and it is implied in 10<sup>17</sup>.

In narrating a series even of the simplest actions, no two observers will select exactly the same details. Every describer will omit some matters as being implied in those which he mentions; and no two will omit the same steps in the action.

It is characteristic of Paul's style that it is hardly possible to say where the words which the Lord speaks end, and where his own comment begins. Is v.<sup>26</sup>, 'For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come,' Paul's interpretation, or does he give this as part of the words of Jesus? The answer must be sought in probabilities and in comparison of other accounts. From Paul's letter we could not come to any sure conclusion, though the word 'for' suggests rather that he attributes the words to Jesus. But none of the other accounts give these words, or anything exactly corresponding to them; and yet even that is not conclusive, for 10<sup>17</sup> and other records imply that more was said than is quoted by any authority.

All that can be asserted is that Paul gradually changes from direct quotation of the Lord's words to statement of his own inferences from the words.



Similarly in Gal 2<sup>14ff.</sup>, it is impossible to tell where the words which Paul actually addressed to Peter end, and where the moral which he drew for the benefit of the Galatians begins: <sup>1</sup> he gradually and insensibly passed from the one to the other. As we have seen, there was much instruction given in discourse by Jesus at this stage of the Supper; and, even though no other authority records these words of v.<sup>26</sup>, it is quite possible that Paul believed them to have been spoken by the Lord. But v.<sup>27</sup> is, unquestionably, Paul's inference and interpretation: Jesus pronounced no words of condemnation and denunciation here, not even though Judas Iscariot was present (for so we shall see the case, disguised as it is by Mark and Matthew).

While Paul's second account of the Eucharist has the value of being a literal and matter-of-fact description of the rite as he transmitted it to the Corinthians (and therefore to all his Churches), and so carries back the tradition to the time of his conversion a few years after the Crucifixion<sup>2</sup>—except for those who, in defiance of the deep conservatism of the East in matters of ritual like this, suppose that the ceremony was transformed and remade during the extension of the Church to the Gentiles—the first account has in some respects an even higher value, when it is regarded from the proper point of view. It is from chap. 10 that we learn most about the power and meaning which Paul felt to lie in the Eucharist. That point of view is one with which, in modern times, many find it difficult fully to sympathize. Paul's view is of the first century, the belief of one trained in Jewish thought and in the ideas of a Græco-Oriental city like Tarsus; and it is not easy to understand it. Many of us, who catch eagerly at the idea of the 'power' that lies in the rite, hastily identify Paul's conception with later ideas of a mediæval type on the subject; but probably they do not err so far from the truth as those do who neglect altogether the power which he attributes to the sacred rite, and see in it a mere symbolic and occasional reminiscence of the Lord's death.

One who reads chap. 11 too superficially might readily understand from v.<sup>17</sup> that Paul thought of the rite only in that fashion, as a memory and testimony of 'the Lord's death.' But underneath

that verse lies the whole transcendent and supreme potentiality which Paul knew to exist in the fact of that death. The Lord's death was to Paul the essential and overpowering fact in the force of the Faith, *i.e.* it was the triumphant display in a form that men's senses could appreciate of the Divine power over all the falsities and shams and outward show of the world.

The account in chap. 10 must therefore always be read along with that in 11, as indeed it necessarily would be fresh in the mind of the reader who takes the Epistle as a continuous letter, and does not cheat himself by reading 11 apart from 10. The two accounts are closely united. They form part of the treatment of one subject; and the view which is most prominently put in 10 is repeated in 12<sup>12</sup> under another image: 'As the body is one and hath many members . . . so also is Christ, for in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit.'

It is through the first account, then, unliteral and regardless of order and sequence in time as it is, that we gather better what Paul saw in the Eucharist—the triumph of spirit over matter, the reality of spirit, the unreality of matter, the absolute oneness of the Church in spite of apparent division in space. The rite is a method of lifting men for the moment so that they can regard the world and human life on the plane of eternal truth and reality—so that they can be in the Spirit and forget the material conditions which obscure the spiritual reality.

The importance of these references to the Eucharist in the early history of Christianity is incalculable. Without them it would appear from Paul's other letters that he attached small consequence to the rite; and the teaching of John would be separated by an apparently impassable gulf from that of the Synoptics. Paul makes the bridge once and for all in this Epistle; and yet it is only, in a sense, accidental that he mentions the subject. A question and a difficulty suggested the explanation. It is an excellent example of the valuelessness of the argument *a silentio*. But for a chance, we should have been ignorant of Paul's views. We should be slow, therefore, in arguing that Mark failed to perceive the power that Paul saw in the rite. Did Mark intend to explain his views and beliefs on this matter? If he did not, his silence means nothing.

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. Comm. on Galatians*, p. 305.

<sup>2</sup> Three years I believe to be the probable length of the interval between the two events.



# The Great Text Commentary.

## THE GREAT TEXTS OF REVELATION.

### REVELATION XXI. 5.

'And he that sitteth on the throne said, Behold, I make all things new.'—R.V.

#### I.

##### THE SPEAKER.

I. The Speaker is God the Father. Throughout the whole Book of Revelation, says Swete, 'He that sitteth on the throne' is the Almighty Father, as distinguished from the Incarnate Son. And so it is probable that here for the first time in the book we listen to the words of God Himself, for it is the first time that 'He that sitteth on the throne' is represented as speaking. His words go to the centre of things and reach to their circumference, and they are gracious in their purpose: 'Behold, I make all things new.'

2. Is there a difficulty in the representation of the Father as Judge supreme? The doctrine seems to join issue with Jn 5<sup>21</sup>, 'For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son'; and indeed with the whole current of early Christian tradition. Swete finds a possible reconciliation of the two views in the oneness of the Father and the Son (Jn 10<sup>30</sup>)—when the Son acts, the Father acts with and through Him (Jn 5<sup>19</sup>). St. Paul speaks of the judgment-seat of Christ (2 Co 5<sup>10</sup>), and also of the judgment-seat of God (Ro 14<sup>10</sup>).

It would seem as if the threefold Personality had become united in one name. No more we hear of 'Let us make,' we are now confronted by an intenser term, 'Behold, I make all things new.' It would seem as if each Person in the Divine Trinity had times of special expression and times of special relation to nature and to man and to providence and to destiny; now it is the Father; and the other Persons of the Trinity are concealed, as it were, behind His glory: now it is the Son, the only-begotten Son, the Saviour of the world: and, finally, it is the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, who rules the whole mystery of human development. And what if now the Three should in a peculiar and definite sense be One—as if the Three-One should all be speaking in, 'Behold, I make all things new.'<sup>1</sup>

#### II.

##### THE PLACE OF THE PROMISE.

There are three texts which should be taken together:

<sup>1</sup> J. Parker, *The City Temple Pulpit*, i. 4.

'And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good' (Gn 1<sup>31</sup>).

'For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together (RVm 'with us') until now' (Ro 8<sup>22</sup>).

'And he that sitteth on the throne said, Behold, I make all things new' (Rev 21<sup>5</sup>).

God's world is the subject of these three verses. The first describes God's world as it was; the second, God's world as it is; the third, God's world as it shall be.

I. *God's world as it was when He made it.* The report of it is—and it is God's own report—that it was very good. It could not be improved. It was perfect. God's eye saw no flaw in it. God was satisfied and delighted with it. It was all glory and beauty, music and song, happiness and peace. The Greek word for 'world' contains the idea of order. Nothing was out of place in God's world. But the word 'very good' has more than a material and more than an artistic meaning. It is a moral word. It means that there was a contrast between the world as God made it and the world as it afterwards became. It means that there was no sin in God's world as He made it.

2. *God's world as it is.* It is no longer very good. Ichabod is written across the face of it. Its glory has departed. Not that the primal order has become pure chaos. God 'in his heaven' has been working in the world from the beginning until now. Wherever His hand is not interfered with by the will of man there is order still. Nature is even continually restoring the beauty that man has defaced. It is the moral world and all that depends upon it, the sphere in which the will of man works, that has suffered an eclipse. For sin has entered, and with sin death: the first a murder, the last a suicide. 'Oh that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people' (Jer 9<sup>1</sup>). 'God's in His heaven'; but it is prophecy, not history, to say 'All's right with the world.'

3. *God's world as it shall be.* The first thing is that God is to come down and dwell in it. His tabernacle is with men, and He will dwell with them. The next, that He will recognize and



be recognized by His people. They shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them and be their God. And the third thing is that death and sorrow and pain shall be no more. But how is it that these three things are brought to pass? They are brought to pass through 'the blood of the Lamb.' There has been a sacrifice made for sin and uncleanness, and the sacrifice has taken away sin. When He said, 'It is finished,' He made an end of sin, and opened the way for God to dwell amongst men, opened the way for their reconciliation and fellowship, for the removal of all the things that follow in the path of sin.

### III.

#### NEWNESS NOT NOVELTY.

It is not a new world; it is the old world made new. It is not creation; it is redemption. God has not destroyed the world, to begin again; He has renewed the inhabitants of the old world in the spirit of their minds.

There are two words in the original which are necessarily translated alike—'new'—in our versions. Of these two adjectives, one signifies *new* (*νέος*) in relation to *time*, the other *new* in relation to *quality* (*καινός*)—the first temporal novelty, the second novelty intellectual or spiritual. The first indicates that which is young, recent in time; the other that which not only succeeds something else in time, but which in idea springs out of it, and not only succeeds but supersedes it.<sup>1</sup>

So this word, 'I make all things new,' is not the announcement of a perfectly new thing; it does not proclaim an act at that moment done; it is not an exercise, as it were, of instantaneous Omnipotence. This is the completing and the perfecting, rather, of the work of the long ages, the seal of a mighty progression, the top-stone of the great temple, the finishing of the work of the Sabbath of God from the periods of the First Creation.<sup>2</sup>

To make things new is not the same as to make new things. To make new things is the work of the hand; to make things new is the work of the heart. Whenever one sits upon the throne of the heart, all things are made new. They are made so without changing a line, without altering a feature. Enthroned in your heart an object of love, and you have renewed the universe. You have given an added note to every bird, a fresh joy to every brook, a fairer tint to every flower.<sup>3</sup>

### IV.

#### THE EVIDENCE OF THE NEWNESS.

1. The first evidence will be *the death-blow of evil*. What are the present evils under which the creation groans and travails? Suffering is one. It is Stoicism, not Christianity, that says suffering is no evil. Sickness and weakness are evils; feebleness of hand and step; toil and want; old age, solitary and begrudged and despised; sorrow and crying, not to be comforted because the loved one is not. All these things will depart on that day, because that will be the execution-day of sin.<sup>4</sup>

2. The second evidence of the renovation will be *the re-installment of God*. The Seer saw no temple therein. Why? Because the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. He saw no sun. Why? Because the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. What is the occasion of sickness? It is because the Healer is absent from the earth. Of Death? Because the Life-giver is not at hand. Of loneliness? Because sin has taken away our Lord. But thine eye shall see the King in His beauty, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away.<sup>5</sup>

### V.

#### THE RESULTS OF THE NEWNESS.

1. The 'far-off' brought nigh. He who was a stranger to God becomes a child in his Father's house. An heir of God, a joint-heir with Jesus Christ. When John Wesley was dying, in a brief moment of returning consciousness, he asked, 'What was the text that I preached upon last Sunday?' And when one standing beside him repeated, 'For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor that ye through His poverty might become rich,' he exclaimed, 'Yes; that is it. There is no other.'

A modest, gentle, kindly business man once stood before me with shining eyes, telling of the joy that had come to him as the result of his giving himself in middle life to the Lord. 'To think,' he said, 'that for more than twenty years I have tried to do this for myself and could not; and now in one hour the Lord has done it for me.'<sup>6</sup>

2. Bitterness turned into blessing. A wonderful sentence comes to us from the Middle Ages. Out

<sup>1</sup> W. Alexander, *The Great Question*, 284.

<sup>2</sup> D. Wright, *The Power of an Endless Life*, 257.

<sup>3</sup> G. Matheson, *Times of Retirement*, 92.

<sup>4</sup> C. J. Vaughan, *Family Prayer and Sermon Book*, i. 124.

<sup>5</sup> C. J. Vaughan, *ibid.* 125.

<sup>6</sup> H. A. Stimson, *The New Things of God*, 14.



of the turmoil, the vice and the bloodshed of the Florence of that day, we hear the voice of the great poet as he says in his immortal words: 'In sua voluntade è nostra pace' ('In the doing of His will lies our peace'). How did Dante know that? Has any thought risen higher than that through all the centuries? In the doing of God's will, the surrendering of ourselves to His appointment, the accepting of the cup because He sent it, is not only the discipline we need, not only the promise of strength and attainment, but, far more than this, the peace, the deep abiding divine peace of the soul.

In a Christian Conference one of the speakers during an interval pointed out to his neighbour a man in the audience. Once a notorious drunkard, he said, for a year he has been so changed that it is like a transformation. 'And do you see that lad?' he asked. 'That is his son. I met him one day on the street, and I said, "Well, Willie, how are you getting on now?" "Oh, splendid!" he said. "Oor hame's juist like a magic lantern since faither stoppit drinkin'!"'

3. The unproductive become fruitful. The promise is, 'Ye shall bear much fruit.' This is to be the measure and the reward of a true discipleship. This is Christ's reward. This is how He is to see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied. There is that in every heart which responds to this thought. We can all understand something of the feeling of the farmer leaning on his gate and looking at the waving fields of grain about him. He has planted and cultivated and waited for the harvest, and here it is. He has made the waste land fruitful, and his soul is filled with a supreme satisfaction. Look at the light in the face of the young father over his new-born child, or the joy of the mother as for the first time she presses her infant to her heart. Life has produced life. Fruitfulness has come, the blessed gift of God. We all know its significance; even the dullest and weariest long for its privileges.<sup>1</sup>

Sir Wilfrid Lawson the elder (father of the late baronet), on reaching middle life, had a dangerous illness; and when brought (as he thought) to death's door, and when the unseen realities of the eternal world seemed breaking upon him, he longed for religious instruction, guidance, and consolation. This he did not expect to find among the worldly or sporting parsons of the neighbouring parishes, and so he sent for a humble Presbyterian minister from the neighbouring hamlet of Blennerhasset—a Mr. Walton—who by his instructions and prayers, by God's blessing, brought peace of mind to Sir Wilfrid, so that when he rose from his

sick-bed it was with a new view of life and a new purpose in living. In a word, he had become a true earnest Christian upon personal inquiry and conviction, and his tastes and inclinations and aims were completely changed, and he determined henceforth to spread those views of truth that had changed and blessed him, by devoting time and thought and means to their diffusion among his neighbours and friends. Having obtained a peace of mind never known before, he was anxious that those around should share the same priceless treasure. The Scriptures were a new revelation to him, and with strong faith in Jesus Christ as a loving, ever-present Saviour, he felt constrained by example and word and walk to lead others to trust in and serve Him.<sup>2</sup>

## VI.

### THE EXTENT OF IT.

The words of the Seer are suggested by Is 43<sup>18, 19</sup>: 'Remember ye not the former things, neither consider the things of old. Behold, I will do a new thing.' But, says Swete, the scope of the old prophecy is enlarged indefinitely by the words 'all things.' All the fruits of the New Covenant are included.

I. Man is included. The new world begins in the human heart, and it occupies every part of the personality, and every aspect of the life. By his words a man is now justified. His thoughts are brought into captivity to the mind of Christ. Moreover, the newness covers the relation between man and man. There will be the fulfilment of both commandments—the first and greatest, and also the second which is like unto it.

Dr. Parker said in New York: 'God and one man could make any other religion, but it takes God and two men to make Christianity! The pulpit, as I say, has forgotten that two men were necessary. It has talked of the relations of God to the individual soul, and it has dealt with the supreme command to love God supremely; but it has forgotten that the second great commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," is simply the application of the same law to man in his manward relation, and that it has precisely the same origin and precisely the same sanctions as the other command. If one is binding, both are binding. If the Church is under obligations to teach the world the love of God, it is under like obligations to teach and to exemplify the love of our fellow-men. We have thought of Christianity, the teachings of Christ, as a circle drawn round the individual as its centre. Hereafter we must think of Christianity, the teachings of Jesus, as an ellipse drawn round the individual and society as two foci. Jesus laid down certain social laws for the Kingdom as a society. He laid down certain social laws to which we shall have occasion to return later.'<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> H. A. Stimson, *The New Things of God*, 19.

<sup>2</sup> G. W. E. Russell, *Life of Sir Wilfrid Lawson*.

<sup>3</sup> J. Strong, in *Christian World Pulpit*, lxvi. 18.



When the organist Mr. John Zundel was converted and came into the church, he said to me one morning, 'It seems that everything in the world is new. Last night I prayed; but not as you do.' I asked him what he meant, and he answered: 'I do not speak my prayers.' 'Well,' I asked, 'how do you pray?' 'On the piano always,' said he. That was true. He would sit down at his piano when in a worshipping mood, shut his eyes, and pray with his fingers. I did not wonder at it when I heard his music.<sup>1</sup>

2. The whole creation is included. For 'the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now.' Change the man, and you change his world. The new self will make all around it as good as new, though no actual change should pass on it; for, to a very wonderful extent, a man creates his own world. We project the hue of our own spirit on things outside. A bright and cheerful temper sees all things on their sunny side. A weary, uneasy mind drapes the very earth in gloom. Lift from a man his load of inward anxiety, and you change the aspect of the universe to that man; for, if 'to the pure all things are pure,' it is no less true that to the happy all things are happy.<sup>2</sup>

Dr. S. Reynolds Turner, who superintends a Chinese colporteur in Amoy, writes: 'He is one of the most earnest Christians I have met in China, and a real red-hot evangelist. In visiting our stations I have seen a good deal of him on his native heath, and one remark he made sticks to me, since it was so strange from a Chinaman. We were standing on a hillside overlooking the sea, which at that part of the coast is dotted over with islands, and I was revelling in the beauty of the scene under a bright sun and clear skies. Suddenly he turned to me, and said, "Isn't it beautiful?" I agreed heartily, but added that I thought Chinamen did not, as a rule, pay attention to such things. "Ah!" he said, "I never saw anything about me, or thought anything beautiful or worth looking at, until I became a Christian; but since then the world gets daily more beautiful, and the more I see of it the more I comprehend our dear Father in heaven."' <sup>3</sup>

I remember, as though it were yesterday, something

<sup>1</sup> H. W. Beecher, *Lectures on Preaching*, 72.

J. Oswald Dykes, *Sermons*, 261.

<sup>3</sup> *Report of B. and F. Bible Society*, 1906.

that happened in my own life at least thirty-seven years ago. I was a boy, and there came to my father's house a young man who had been brought to Christ in some services my father had been conducting away up among the Welsh hills. This young man one day was out in our garden, and talking to me about all sorts of things. He interested me as a child, and I loved him. Suddenly he stooped down and took a leaf from a nasturtium plant, put it on his hand, and said to me, 'Did you ever see anything so beautiful?' And I looked, and saw all the veins, and the exquisite beauty of it all. Then he said, 'Do you know, I never saw how beautiful that leaf was until six months ago, when I gave myself to Christ?' I have never forgotten that. How true I know that to be in my own experience!<sup>4</sup>

But the change is not only in the man himself. Creation recognizes the change in him and responds. Where he leads, it follows. If he mourns, it will lament. If he pipes to it, it will dance.

Some travellers once vainly tried to awaken a wonderful echo. Then a rough bugler by the roadside played a simple scale down the instrument. At once the echo answered. The hills sounded far and farther off as if with church bells, peal on peal, chime on chime, until they who had listened almost wept to lose that silver music in the enchanted distance. Let us play the simple old scale. All the magic is in the echo. That makes the old sounds new.<sup>5</sup>

#### LITERATURE.

G. Matheson, *Times of Retirement*, 92; W. Alexander, *The Great Question*, 284; J. Parker, *The City Temple Pulpit*, i. 2; J. Oswald Dykes, *Sermons*, 249; H. A. Stimson, *The New Things of God*, 9; D. Wright, *The Power of an Endless Life*, 255; C. J. Ellicott, *The Destiny of the Creature*, 77; J. Parker, *Studies in Texts*, iii. 151; C. J. Vaughan, *The Family Prayer and Sermon Book*, i. 121; G. Hunsworth, *Light in the Gloom*, 37; M. F. Sadler, *Sermon Outlines for the Clergy and Lay Preachers*, 84; A. C. Price, *Fifty Sermons*, vol. vi. 17; E. M. Dewhurst, *The King and His Servants*, 59; R. E. Hutton, *The Crown of Christ*, ii. 75; *The Preacher's Magazine* (1897), 27 (W. Wakinsshaw); *The Church Pulpit Year Book* (1906) 33, (1910) 5; *The Christian World Pulpit*, x. 168 (G. W. M'Cree), lxvi. 17 (J. Strong), lxvii. 86 (Kirsopp Lake).

<sup>4</sup> Dr. Campbell Morgan, in *British Weekly*, 1909.

<sup>5</sup> W. Alexander, *The Great Question*, 307.



## Crete, the Jordan, and the Rhône.

By J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A., LITT.D., LL.D., WOODBROOKE SETTLEMENT, BIRMINGHAM.

THE advanced culture of the early settlers in Crete, and the influence of Cretan civilization upon the rest of the Mediterranean, are becoming every day more recognized. It is interesting, therefore, to pick up any threads of history or tradition which may enable us to connect the Cretan civilization with its mysterious origins on the one hand, or with the later civilizations on the other hand, which may have come under its influence. In this regard it was worthy of note that Fick has recently in his study of Greek Place-names of the first period (*Vorgriechische Ortsnamen*, Göttingen, 1905), made the suggestion that the civilization of the Rhône valley was due, in the first instance, to Cretans. We are all aware how early was the Hellenic influence in Southern Gaul, and how constantly the first settlements were reinforced from Greece and from Asia Minor; but the origin of the colonization is commonly referred to the Phocæans, who begin the long chain of influence that continues to the days of Pothinus, Irenæus, and the Churches of Smyrna and elsewhere in Asia Minor.<sup>1</sup> The reason why Fick threw out the suggestion that the Cretans were in Southern Gaul before the Phocæans was due to his recognition of a Cretan affinity in the name of Marseilles.

'The name of the river Massalia, which flows into the sea on the south-west of Middle Crete between Cape Psychion and the little coast-town Lamos (see Bursian, *Geographie von Griechenland*, ii. 547), reminds one forcibly of Massalia-Marseilles, the city settled by the Phocæans. This can hardly be an accident. In that case the Cretans will have discovered and settled at the mouths of the Rhône before the Phocæans.'

Fick goes on to suggest that the same thing has happened in Corsica, where original Cretan settlements underlie the colonies of the Phocæans. The suggestion is an extremely interesting one, and sets one thinking: for it is clear that if the Cretans are in the Rhône valley before the Phocæans and later bodies of Greek immigrants, we ought to find further traces of them in the nomenclature of this

part of Gaul. For example, Fick, in discussing the early Cretan names to the east of Gortyna, stumbles upon a place to the east of Vinatos (*Ἰνατος*), which Stephanus the Geographer calls by the name of *Βιέννος*. Fick corrects the spelling to *Βιάννος*, shows from the inscriptions that the people who live there are called *Βιάννοι*, and identifies the place with a little village which now bears the name Viano. He suggests further that the double *n* is for an original *nd*, and finds a parallel in the name of a little town called *Βιάνδινα ἢ Βιανδίνου πόλις* on the promontory of Taenarum at the southern extremity of the Peloponnese. The suggestion at once arose in my mind that we had here a name that was exactly parallel to the name of Vienne in Southern Gaul, one of the great cities of Roman and Pre-Roman times. It is curious that Fick, who was so ready to recognize the Cretan origin of Marseilles, does not seem to have suspected this parallel. But it had already been pointed out by Stephanus, who has the actual tradition that Vienna was a Cretan colony from Viennus in Crete.<sup>2</sup> And since Dion Cassius (xlv. 50) says that the Allobroges (whose chief city Vienna is) had expelled some previous settlers, it seems not unreasonable to suppose that these were the Cretans, who suffered some reverse here in the days of their early colonization. I had not seen the reference in Stephanus, in making the connexion between the Cretan *Βιάννος* and the Greek *Οὐιέννα*.

<sup>2</sup> Stephanus' statement is as follows:—

Biennos, a city of Crete: some say that it takes its name from Biennos, one of the Curetes; others, that it is named after the violent deed (*Βίαις*) done in the matter of Ares, which they say was here done by Otus and Ephialtes, the sons of Poseidon; and even to the present day the murder-hecatombs are here sacrificed to Ares.

The citizens are called Bienni; but some say that they pay dues to Zeus Temilios and to Biennios. There is also another city of the name in Gaul; for when once upon a time a pestilence had seized on Crete, the inhabitants migrated elsewhere, and some occupied Hydruntum, a city of Italy not yet enclosed. And an oracle was given them, that they should colonize the most marshy place they could find. So they came to a marshy place on the Rhône, a river of Gaul, and dwelt there, and named their city Bianna, because one of the young women in their party, named Bianna, was swallowed up in a chasm while dancing; and this city is commemorated by Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History*.

<sup>1</sup> Justin. 43. 3, 6: 'Itaque Phocæenses in ultimam Oceani oram procedere ausi, in sinum Gallicum circum ostia Rhodani amnis devenere.'



The tradition that one of the virgins who migrated with them, named herself Bianna, was swallowed up in a chasm, is, probably, only an afterthought to explain away the fact that the city of Vienne, like so many famous cities of the East, was built upon a sacrifice at the corner-stone in the shape of a young virgin, who becomes the Fortune of the city. Stephanus gives her name correctly as Bianna.

I venture to suggest, then, that Stephanus was right when he said that Vienne had been founded by the Cretans. The name of the original settlement was perhaps *Βιανδός*.

If we have correctly followed the suggestions of Fick in regard to the Cretan colonization of the Rhône Valley, we ought certainly to go a step further and ask whether other traces of Cretan occupation can be detected. The names, to be conclusive, should be Pre-Hellenic as well as Cretan, for the Cretan settlers are to be the first in the field at Marseilles, unless, perhaps, we are to allow for a Phœnician Colony. The first question, then, that arises is as to the name of the river itself that flows between the two Cretan settlements, Marseilles and Vienne. It used to be supposed that the name was genuine Greek, and that it had been given to the river by settlers from the Island of Rhodes in remembrance of the Island of Roses, from which they had come. But this opinion has generally been abandoned, and it appears to be a conflict to-day between those who hold that the name is Ligurian, and those who take it to be Celtic. Leaving, for the present, the philological question between Ligurian and Celtic, let us turn to the pre-Hellenic rivers in Crete, and see what they offer that is in any way similar to the name of the Rhône (*Ῥοδανός*).

We immediately light upon a curious problem which becomes more and more perplexing and at the same time interesting, as we examine it.

The most important river in Western Crete is the *Ἰάρδαρος* or *Ἰαρδάνης*; the form of the name suggests at once that we are dealing with Pre-Hellenic or non-Hellenic matter. On this river, according to the *Odyssey*, lived the Kydones:

Ἐνθα Κύδωνες ἔβαιον Ἰαρδάνον ἀμφὶ ῥέεθρα  
(*Od.* γ. 292).

And it was not unnatural that early critics of the geography of this passage thought they had come upon a certain trace of Semitic influence, and

identified the river's name with that of the Jordan, thus making the Kydones a Semitic people, or, at all events, explaining the nomenclature by Semitic influence. But to this there are grave objections. First of all, there are other rivers whose names agree very closely with the Cretan *Jardanos*. One of them, according to the *Iliad*, is in Elis:

Φειᾶς πὰρ τείχεσσιν Ἰαρδάνον ἀμφὶ ῥέεθρα  
(*Il.* H. 135);

another is in Lydia, for Stephanus of Byzantium says—

Ἰάρδαρος πόνταμος Λυδίας;

and Fick points out that this must be correct because in the Lydian Mythology *Ἰάρδαρος* (the river-god?) is the father of the Lydian Mother-goddess Omphale.<sup>1</sup>

It is natural, then, to connect the Cretan river with these two other Jordans, and not with the Palestinian; and this seems to exclude Semitic influence altogether.

The problem becomes, however, more interesting, when we discover that Semitic scholars are in serious doubt whether the name of the Jordan is itself Semitic.

Setting aside the early patristic explanation that the name is made up out of two Hebrew words, *yor*, יֹר, which means 'river' (? the Nile), and *Dan*, an explanation which turns up in all sorts of odd corners of the Patristic Literature, we have the best explanation of the word in the stem *yarad* ('to descend'), from a primitive *warad*, the name being very appropriate on account of its rapid descent from its sources near Mt. Hermon to the Dead Sea. But even to this apparently satisfactory derivation objections have been taken, and Stade, in his *Hebrew Grammar*, gives reasons for rejecting it. If it is not Semitic, what is it? Can it be Hittite? In that case the other three Jordans, of which one is definitely Lydian, may belong with it. Moreover, in that case, there will be a fifth river that will have to be grouped with them. For the suggestion made above of the existence of the collateral Hebrew forms *yarad* and *warad* may be valid elsewhere than in Hebrew. And there is, according to Ptolemy, a river on the Black Sea, whose name is Vardanes; it is a branch of the Atticitus river in Sarmatia (Ptol. v. 9, 28). This river can hardly be detached from the other four.

<sup>1</sup> She is called Iardanis, the nymph, in Ovid. *Hēr.* 103.



So here are five rivers, at least, from some unknown language which has yet to be identified.

My next observation is that the name Vardon, upon which we have stumbled, is the name of two of the tributaries of the Rhône. Every one knows the *Pont de Gard* near Avignon, and those who are acquainted with French Philology (which makes *guerre* out of *war*, and *garde* out of *ward*) will recognize in the Gard or Gardon an earlier Wård or Wardon. There are two streams of the name Gard, the Gardon d'Alais, and the Gardon d'Anduze, which coalesce and flow into the Rhône below the Pont du Gard. The original name of the stream was Vardo or Vardon.<sup>1</sup>

Now this name agrees closely with the forms that we have already been studying, both in Crete and in Asia Minor, and on the Black Sea, so that I do not hesitate to label it as Cretan, and as the name given by the early settlers from that island. Counting the two Vardons as a single stream, we have now six rivers belonging to the same group.

If, however, Vardon is the right name for one of the upper branches of the Rhône, the inference is, at least, a probable one that this is the original form for the Rhodanus itself, which has been preserved in its upper waters. We have an instructive parallel in the name of the river Thames, which is a combination, or, as Spenser would say, the result of a marriage between the Thames and Isis. The combination represents a later date than the two original names, and it is easy to infer that the name of Thame once held right down to the sea. Even in Milton's time, the Thames at Windsor could be spoken of as 'royal-towered Thame.'<sup>2</sup>

Now, apart altogether from the meaning or origin of the name *Ἰάπωνος*, it is difficult to resist the suggestion of some connexion between the name *Vardon* and the name *Rhodanus*; and any explana-

tion of the similarity of the names requires that Vardon should be the older form. But this brings us again so close to the *Jardanos* group and the associated Sarmatian *Vardanes*, that we are almost obliged to take them all together and look for a common etymological origin.<sup>3</sup> This means, that we must connect the Rhône, as well as the cities on its banks, with the primitive Cretan migration, and have no need to resort to Ligurian or Celtic derivations. The name may have undergone Gallicization, it was not originally Celtic.

Then we have to inquire further into the supposed Cretan ancestry and the meaning of the name. Those who derived the name of the Gallic river from Rhodes and its assumed settlers, and from the rose which is the symbol of the island, had a difficulty to face in the fact that no one knows the origin of the name Rhodes, nor to what language the Greek word *ῥόδον* originally belongs. The Armenian for *rose* is *vard*, and the Arabic is *ward*, but it does not seem to be a Semitic stem.<sup>4</sup>

The Armenian language has probably borrowed it from somewhere; the source, for example, might be Hittite, if Hittite were different from primitive Armenian.

Whatever be the origin, we may be sure that changes which made a primitive *ward* into a Greek *ῥόδον* would not contradict a similar connexion between *Warden* and *Rhodanos*. The discovery of the collateral Vardon in the upper waters of the Rhône helps our identification greatly; and at all events we see clearly in what direction to look for the origin of the divergent names of the river. It is even possible that Rhodanus might, after all, mean 'Rosy.'

We have now followed out Fick's suggestions so far as to detect early Cretan influence in the names of Marseilles, of Vienna, of Vardon and the Pont du Gard, and of the Rhône itself. The ultimate source may be Hittite, but of that we only know enough to say, that the less said dogmatically about an undeciphered language the better. There is

<sup>1</sup> So in Sidonius Apollinaris, p. 50: "Siquidem domibus mediis it Vuardo fluvius, nisi cum deflua nive pastus impalluit flavis ruber glareis, et per alveum perspicuus, quietus, calculusque, neque ob hoc minus piscium ferax delictorum."

<sup>2</sup> Spenser, *Faerie Queene*, iv. II, 24.

So went he playing on the watery plaine,  
Soon after whom the lovely bridegroom came,  
The noble Thamys, with all his goodly traine;  
But him before there went, as best became,  
His aunccient parents, namely, th' aunccient Thame,  
But much more aged was his wife than he,  
The Ouze, whom men do Isis rightly name.

<sup>3</sup> It is curious and amusing that Rufinus, when he tried to find a Celtic etymology for the name of the Rhône, imitated closely the old Patristic etymology of the Jordan, as follows:—*De nominibus Gallicis*, 4: '*Roth* violentiam, *dan* et in Gallico et in Hebraeo iudicem; ideo *Hrodanus* iudex violentus.'

<sup>4</sup> One of the depressions on the road from Suez to Sinai goes by the name of the Wady Wardan; I do not know of any explanation that has ever been made of it. But it should be noted.



nothing to prevent the assignment of all the Jordan rivers of Crete, Asia Minor, Sarmatia, and Palestine, to a Hittite nomenclature, *if other evidence should point that way*. Only we must remember Mr. Andrew Lang's comments on Professor Sayce's statement that 'the Moschi seem to have spoken a language allied to that of the Cappadocians and

Hittites.' 'That is to say,' says Mr. Lang, 'it is not impossible that the language of the Moschi, about which next to nothing is known, may have been allied to that of the Cappadocians, about which we know next to nothing.' 'Where Professor Sayce is, the Hittites, if we may say so respectfully, are not very far off.'

## In the Study.

### The Beautiful Word 'Ransom.'

ONE of the first sermons in the new volume of the *Christian World Pulpit*—it is the 76th volume, containing the sermons from July to December, 1909 (James Clarke & Co. ; 4s. 6d.)—one of its first sermons is entitled 'The Servant-Redeemer.' The preacher is the Rev. Herbert Snell, B.A., and the text is Mt 20<sup>28</sup>, 'Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.'

The Servant-Redeemer? Why must the Servant be a Redeemer, and why must the Redeemer be a Servant? That was the vision of Isaiah—'Behold my servant': 'and with his stripes we are healed.' It means that the redemption of man is to be accomplished by the instrumentality of God. Not against God's will; not simply with God's acquiescence; but in full harmony with God's purpose and under God's direction. The Redeemer is to be God's servant, the instrument of His hand, used by God for our healing. But redemption is the payment of a price. It is wounding; it is stripes. The servant must also be a sufferer. 'Suffering goodness,' says Mr. Snell, 'is an equivalent for the service of God.'

It is a mighty truth. How did Isaiah attain to it? Not by quiet thinking, but by the pressure of experience. 'Just as diamonds are generally discovered in the beds of rivers flowing through volcanic districts, the product of stupendous pressure during awful eruptions, so this gem originated in that wild chaotic period of Israel's history when she was the captive of tyranny and of idolatry, when empires clashed in conflict around her prison walls, and buried her destiny in hopeless débris.'

He came as a Servant. So every man of genius or of greatness comes as the servant of man. Did He come, like Plato, to serve to intellectual progress? Did He come, like Luther, for the reformation of doctrine? Did He come, like Cromwell, for political reconstruction? Did He come, like Shakespeare, for the culture of the imagination in poetic and dramatic ideals? He came as a Servant in order to redeem man. And for that end no one ever came but Himself.

But He was a Physician. He healed all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people. He did not heal as a physician; He healed as a Redeemer. His service to the sick of the palsy was not 'Rise up and walk,' but 'Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee.'

But He came as a Teacher. Did they not say, 'Never man spake like this man.' He did not teach as a Rabbi, but as a Redeemer. 'The Sermon on the Mount, with its sublime precepts, its ravishing melody of language, would yet never have led captive the mind and heart of man but for the Cross. We all remember Holman Hunt's famous picture of the carpenter's shop in Nazareth with the mother of Jesus bending over the chest containing the gifts of the wise men, and the young carpenter stretching his arms above his head in weariness, while his shadow, the shadow of a cross, shows behind Him on the wall. If I get close to the Sermon on the Mount and examine it, I see there the shadow of the cross on every page.'

'He gave his life a ransom.' Ransom is a beautiful word. Mr. Snell says so. And that says much for Mr. Snell. By our words we shall be justified—by the words we speak, and also by the words we love. How are you drawn to the word 'blood,' for instance? How are you drawn to the



word 'ransom'? Mr. Snell says it is a beautiful word.

But he does not play with it. He seeks to discover its meaning. 'It was a word in ordinary and everyday use among the Hebrews. In every Jewish family, if the firstborn was a boy, the father "ransomed" him, when he was thirty days old, from the service of the sanctuary by paying five shekels to the priest. That money was "ransom." It permitted him to follow that trade or profession to which opportunity or natural bent inclined him.'

Mr. Snell gives this illustration :

'In George Eliot's *Romola*, Baldassarre, the slave, gave gems to his adopted son, Tito Melema, that he might ransom him. But that young man, wishing to live a life of pleasure, and make for himself a secure nest in the world, preferred to sell the gems for his own profit. On one occasion, Bardo, Romola's blind father, asked to be allowed to handle them, but Tito said, "They are in the safe keeping of a goldsmith, who has strong and safe places for such things: he estimates them as worth at least 500 ducats." "Ah, then, they are fine gems," said Bardo, "500 ducats! Ah! more than a man's ransom." It was a mere phrase of common parlance, at a time when men were often being ransomed from slavery or imprisonment, but it smote like a knife on Tito's conscience, for they *were* a man's ransom, though he did not intend to use them as such.'

Jesus Christ came into the world bringing with Him priceless gems, all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. In Him was all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. But He emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant. He poured out His wealth in the redeeming of sinful men. He spent His jewels on our ransom.

Was He ever tempted to use them for Himself? Yes, that is the meaning of the battle in the wilderness. 'If thou art the Son of God, command this stone that it be made bread'—spend thy jewels to satisfy thy hunger. 'If thou art the Son of God, cast thyself down'—give them for admiration and personal éclat. 'If thou wilt fall down and worship me, all shall be thine'—barter them for the empire of the world. But He said no. No, He said, I cannot; they are ransom. 'The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.'

'Give the world all credit for the noble impulses

that now and again run through the arteries of its moral life, but what does the world need to-day, to lift the burden of its misery, so much as Christ's redeeming love?

'Oft when the Word is on me to deliver, lifts the illusion, and the truth lies bare;

Only like souls I see the folk thereunder, bound who should conquer, slaves who should be kings,—

Hearing their one hope with an aching wonder, sadly contented in a show of things:—

Then with a rush the intolerable craving shivers throughout me like a trumpet call, Oh, to save these! to perish for their saving, Die for their life, be offered for them all!'

### Two Studies in Ritschlianism.

A new book on Ritschlianism is a blessing. Two new books are an embarrassment. They are both by Cambridge men. They are identical in size and in price. It is only a careful reading, first of one and then of the other, that brings out their difference and shows it necessary to read them both. Look at them separately.

Mr. John Kenneth Mozley, M.A., Fellow of Pembroke College, has given to his volume the simple title of *Ritschlianism* (Nisbet; 5s. net). He has dedicated it to Professor Herrmann of Marburg, 'in gratitude for much personal kindness received, and in recognition of all that he has done to establish the true meaning and significance of Christian Faith.' We judge accordingly that the book is to be sympathetic to the Ritschlians, and we judge rightly. It is also sympathetic to Ritschlianism, though not so sympathetic.

That is the very point of view which Mr. Mozley takes up. Ritschl and his followers deserve utmost gratitude for their good intention. They realized the existence of a situation that was critical for Christianity, and they honestly attempted to meet it and supply what was needed. The gravity of that situation is not yet fully understood, and consequently Ritschlianism has been judged too exclusively on its own merits, as if it were a defence of Christianity without date or country, and so it has been found wanting. But when the Church comes to realize that there was in Ritschl's day a considerable body of thinking men who were divorced from Christianity because of the intellectual difficulties it presented, she will recognize

the honesty and ability of the Ritschlian attempt to meet that serious situation, and will be more patient of its partial failure.

For it has partly failed. Mr. Mozley takes up the great characteristic questions one by one and expounds them—the Ritschlian attitude to Philosophy, Religion and the Idea of God, Revelation, the Value-Judgments, Faith, Communion with God. The exposition is also a criticism. And then he sums up the matter in one concluding chapter, and weighs Ritschlianism in the balance.

First of all, what has Ritschlianism done to commend Christianity to the unbeliever? What is its contribution to Apologetic? For a moment the separation of theology from philosophy seems a great gain. It did seem so for a moment. But what was the result? The philosopher (and in a degree the scientist) simply found himself outside. The apology proved to be addressed only to the believer, who, being a believer, did not need an apology. 'The duty of Christian Apologetic,' says Mr. Mozley, 'is twofold—to show that the facts with which the origin of Christianity is bound up are true facts and not inventions; and secondly, to demonstrate the inherent reasonableness of the Christian religion, and its relation to the presentations of reasons from other quarters. The Ritschlians have not carried out these tasks, though, perhaps, an exception should be made in the case of Harnack, who is at once sympathetic in his attitude towards other religions, and keenly interested in the evangelistic mission of the Church.'

Next, what has Ritschlianism done for Christian piety? It has separated piety from sentimentalism. And that is a great good. For 'Jesulolatry,' as Hort called it, is a danger to which 'Catholics' and 'Evangelicals' are equally liable. This form of religiousness was closely studied by the Ritschlians, and they opposed it by restoring the New Testament conception of faith, and giving it the supremacy over love, laying stress on the unity and redeeming might of the Person of Jesus Christ, and teaching that religion is concerned with the performance of duties in this world and not with states of feeling. But the Ritschlians went wrong when they went so far as to denounce all mysticism and deny the claim of any man to have communion with the exalted Christ.

Lastly, what has been the contribution of Ritschl to systematic theology? He views Christian doctrine from the point of view of the two foci—

Justification by Faith and the Kingdom of God. And the estimate we make of these two centres will depend on what we are. To the Lutheran—such a Lutheran as Ritschl—the weight he hangs on Justification by Faith will not seem excessive. To the Christian social reformer, it will not seem possible to make too much of the idea of the Kingdom of God.

But the Ritschlian contribution to theology is judged not on these great central ideas so much as on its separate parts. What is its doctrine of Christ? Here there has been much dispute among its critics. Mr. Mozley sees that Ritschl could not possibly have constructed a satisfactory doctrine of the Godhead of Christ because he rejected the category of substance. But he says, 'Even if we feel that the neglect of this category amounts logically to a denial of Christ's substantial Deity, we ought not to impute this to the Ritschlians. To speak of Ritschl, Herrmann, and Kaftan as Unitarians is a real abuse of language.'

What, then, of the Atonement? Ritschl's doctrine of the Atonement, says Mr. Mozley, is more genuinely Socinian than his doctrine of Christ's Deity. But that is not the criticism which we usually hear. For 'it is a curious fact,' Mr. Mozley continues, 'that there are many thinkers who would pride themselves on their orthodoxy and attachment to Catholic principles, and shrink with horror from Socinianism where it touches the doctrine of the Incarnation, who yet view with favour an application of thoroughly Socinian and rationalistic principles to the doctrine of the Atonement. But it was the Atonement and not the Incarnation which Socinianism first assailed. This attitude, so surprising in convinced Christians, is due to the belief that the Incarnation stands by itself, and that the Atonement is a mere corollary from it; whereas the true Christian method, and unquestionably the method of the New Testament, is to place the Cross in the forefront, and pass on from that to an assertion of the Divinity of Him who suffered on Calvary. It cannot be said too often that the Cross, not the manger, Calvary, not Bethlehem, is the heart of the New Testament. In England the influence of Dr. Westcott from Cambridge and of the Anglo-Catholic successors of the Tractarians from Oxford combined has tended in the opposite



direction. In the writer's judgment it is a perilous course to throw the doctrine of propitiatory Atonement to the wolves of Rationalism, while yet retaining the belief that the Incarnation can be preserved in its integrity: and it is a course against which the New Testament, as he reads it, stands opposed. We are indeed told that it is the fact of the Atonement which matters, and not theories about it; but if the saying that "Christ died for our sins" is not to be simply a shibboleth, it is impossible to refrain from asking what such an idea implies. In all effective preaching this truth that "Christ died for our sins" has been anything but an idea without positive content; and wherever the Christian Gospel has been most effective, the content of that idea has been the substitution of Christ for us in His sufferings and death.'

The title which Mr. Ernest A. Edghill, M.A., sometime Scholar of King's College, Cambridge, has given to his study of Ritschlianism is *Faith and Fact* (Macmillan; 5s. net). It is a more elementary book than Mr. Mozley's, and begins nearer the beginning. Mr. Edghill believes, and there is no doubt that he is right in believing, that Ritschlianism will never be understood except by those who come to the study of it from a knowledge of the philosophical atmosphere in which Ritschl found himself. Accordingly he devotes two chapters to an exposition of immediately preceding philosophical speculation, the first chapter being on Kant, Lange, and Lotze, the second on Schleiermacher and the Romantic School. These preliminary chapters are well written and may be read by any one with refreshing.

There follows the exposition of Ritschlianism. It is at once an exposition and a criticism. Mr. Edghill is not intensely interested in the Ritschlians. He judges the system apart from the men. But he does not judge it unsympathetically. Although for the system as a whole his judgment is condemnation, for he finds it 'impossible to accept Ritschlianism as any adequate substitute for the traditional faith of Christendom,' yet he has a good word to say for nearly every one of its

separate elements, and so good a word for some of them that he is willing to accept them as they stand.

Mr. Edghill has, as we have said, a keen sense of the necessity of understanding the philosophical situation into which Ritschlianism was born. He has not so keen an apprehension of the nearer theological situation. No man can possibly understand Ritschlianism who does not recognize it as the offspring and heir of the Reformation. No man can possibly appreciate Ritschl himself who does not appreciate the Reformers. But Mr. Edghill has no interest in the Reformation. The Reformers are nothing to him. Ritschlianism, he says, claims to be the true evangelical theology. It is 'a claim we are not prepared to admit or to deny.' He is aware that Ritschl and his followers try to make clear, 'often at excessive pains,' that they are only developing Lutheran ideas. He admits that on the whole they do not make out a bad case for themselves. 'However,' he says, 'this is a question best left to those who are most qualified to deal with it, or who feel themselves chiefly concerned in the matter.' And he adds: 'The present writer is unconscious of any such vital interest, nor does he possess the necessary qualifications to decide whether the "plerophorie," with which the Ritschlians vindicate the Lutheran character for their theology is or is not justified.'

But these frank admissions must not be allowed to prejudice one against the book. There is no doubt that Mr. Edghill, like Professor Orr, estimates the value of Ritschlianism according to its conformity to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, although his idea of what the doctrine of the Catholic Church is, differs considerably from Dr. Orr's idea. Mr. Mozley, on the other hand, like Dr. Garvie, estimates its worth according to what it has done for the recovery of Christianity in our day, and the appeal it makes to the modern mind. Both estimates are necessary. It is for this reason that we say Mr. Edghill's book should be read even by those who have read Mr. Mozley's.

## The Life of Faith.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. W. W. HOLDSWORTH, BIRMINGHAM.

### The Informing Spirit.

JOHN XVI. 1-15.

WE have seen that the blessedness which Christ holds out to His disciples through union with Him is the blessedness of life; and we have seen that the joy, knowledge, effective power, and readiness for suffering which follow upon our union with Him, are true issues of life. But to us men life implies a spirit within us, a spirit which really makes us capable of these effects, which gives reality to our experience, bestows upon us that balance which is right judgment, that moral sense which enables us to perceive and also stimulates us to do the right, until at last it links us to God in bonds as strong as they are unseen. We shall expect to find, then, in this new life a spirit which will give shape to our moral ideals, and enlighten while it forms,—an informing spirit whose gift shall be the threefold gift of knowledge, power, and character. And this is exactly what Christ promises. At the very centre of the life which we are to live in Him, we may find, He tells us, a Spirit sent by Him to abide, never to leave us, to be in us, to exert His power permanently at the centre of our life.

Christ has first to recall His disciples from the contemplation of their own impending loss to the great gift which should follow upon that 'going' which they deplored, but which they so little understood. He had shielded them hitherto, and the thought that that shelter was to be removed filled their hearts with sorrow. So full were they of their loss that no one asked how this departure affected Him, and thus they were in danger of missing the abiding significance of His departure for themselves. There are three words<sup>1</sup> for 'going away' used over and over again in these chapters,

<sup>1</sup> ἀπέρχουμαι, πορεύομαι, and ὑπάγω. So Dr. Abbott, *Johannine Vocabulary*, pp. 142 ff. This may be accepted with some reservation. The 28th verse of this chapter, in which Christ gives up the word ὑπάγω which He had previously used and reverts to the more easily understood πορεύομαι, to the great relief of the disciples (v. 29), is strongly in favour of this interpretation. There are, however, many passages in which the word can mean nothing more than withdrawal. See especially the use of the imperative in such passages as Mt 4<sup>10</sup> 9<sup>6</sup>.

and there is a fruitful study to be found in the changes rung on these 'bells of sweet accord.' Let it suffice to say that departure from the point of view of mere separation passes into the idea of a journey, and thence into that of a goal to be reached, a 'going home.'

Christ had before Him the separation which He, no less than His disciples, would feel; but He knew that He was on His way back to the very centre and fountain of life in the bosom of the Father, and that there would proceed thence that Spirit who would give both meaning and power to life, the new life which they would live in Him. It was expedient for them that He should go away, for He was going home, their home and His, and from that source of life should issue He who would be in them and abide, He whose power we recognize within us to-day in the office and work of the Holy Spirit. What is His work? Our Lord says that it is 'to convict the world'; and so we come to verses peculiarly packed with thought. The word 'to convict'<sup>2</sup> (R.V.) implies authoritative examination and unquestionable proof. It means 'to bring home to' the world the true issues of the life it may be living, but it goes even further than this, as implying a power of decisive judgment and of power to enforce it when made. The subjects with which the Spirit deals cover the whole of man's spiritual experience. Past, present, and future are all before us in sin, righteousness, and judgment; and the Spirit will convince men of these because they all turn upon man's attitude to Christ, since the work of the Spirit is to take of that which Christ is,<sup>3</sup> and to reveal that unto us. The great test of sin

<sup>2</sup> ἐλέγχειν. 'Places the truth of the case in a clear light before him' (Westcott).

<sup>3</sup> ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται; cf. Mt 10<sup>40</sup>, where the use of the possessive pronoun rather than the dative of the personal pronoun seems to indicate not, 'I have not the power to give,' but rather 'it does not belong to my nature to give.' If this distinction may be maintained here, this passage will show that the work of the Holy Spirit is to reveal that which Christ is in its unity.



will always be the Person of Christ. He is in Himself the dividing line which separates men. Their sin will be determined by the answer to the question, 'Do they believe upon Him?' It is in such a passage as this that the supreme importance of a true view of faith becomes apparent. Such belief as is indicated here is no mental state of acceptance or conviction; it is not a condition of mind, but an act of will which is before us in this connexion. 'To believe in Christ' is to surrender oneself to Him, and the self-esteem or the selfish obstinacy which makes a man refuse to do that is the assertion of that principle of self-will which is the root of all sin. Want of 'belief' is thus seen to be the secret principle of rebellion against God, of the 'lawlessness' which sin is.<sup>1</sup>

In thus bringing home to the moral consciousness of men all that we mean by 'righteousness,' the ascension of our Lord, His return to the Father, comes into view. For that 'return' completed the historical work of Christ, and in that work the kingdom of righteousness was revealed once for all. We had never known the full power of obedience, or the majesty of law, or the reality of a spiritual fellowship with God, apart from the life of Christ. Men had guessed at righteousness, had felt after it; but in the life of Christ, rounded off and completed by the return to the Father, the prototype of the divine righteousness was at last seen. As St. Paul says, it stands revealed in the gospel of Christ.<sup>2</sup> But this return to the Father is bound up with the sending of the Spirit; therefore He will convince by virtue of that return.

So also with judgment, that final and perfect discrimination, that separation of the tangled and conflicting elements of life, that laying bare of the secret, spiritual factor of life and thought,—the awful judgment of God, is the work of the same Spirit. For in revealing the things of Christ, He reveals that through which the Prince of this world—he in whom the spirit of the world finds its perfect embodiment—is cast out<sup>3</sup> and the world is judged. The standard which he had imposed is overthrown; the criterion of conduct is no

longer self-interest. That has been judged.<sup>4</sup> Christ has in His own life assigned to that its proper place, and in doing so He has made real through the Spirit that final judgment to which we move in certain, inevitable steps. He shall lead you into 'the truth in all its parts.'<sup>5</sup> So run the remarkable words. They hold out to the disciples of all time that moral certainty, that assurance, that moral judgment which we need in a world of conflicting issues, of violent impulses, and of motives never at one stay. St. John was not the first to give the thought expression in literature. Before he wrote this wonderful Gospel, St. Paul had spoken of the man who should 'judge all things.' He had spoken of him as possessing the mind, the moral reason of Christ, and he had designated the man so described as 'the spiritual man.'<sup>6</sup> The phrase is remarkable. It does not mean the man whose thoughts turn more easily to the spiritual as distinguished from the material world; nor does it indicate merely the man with a pious turn of mind. It means the man whose spirit is in living contact with the Spirit of God. For it is in the meeting of the human with the Divine Spirit that there is given to us that moral and spiritual perception which bestows upon us the 'right judgment in all things' for which we so often pray. There is no room here for that censorious spirit so ready to proclaim and to condemn the failures of men either in thought or deed. The expression indicates rather that meek and self-distrustful spirit whose power is not of its own, but is the gift of God, and which consists of a readiness to recognize that which is of Christ as it may be made known to us by the Spirit of God. It is He who calls to us from across the gulf that separates life from life: He declares it unto us, declares it so that the message reaches and blesses our ears.<sup>7</sup> He does this because He is the Spirit of truth, the Spirit who gives expression to truth. And what is that truth? 'He shall take of that which is myself,' says Christ, and 'reveal that unto you.' No one can hope either to fully describe

<sup>4</sup> κέκριται, perfect, 'stands judged'; cf. νῦν κρίσις ἐστὶ τοῦ κόσμου (Jn 12<sup>31</sup>).

<sup>5</sup> εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, 'Into the complete understanding of and sympathy with that absolute Truth which is Christ Himself' (Westcott).

<sup>6</sup> 1 Co 2<sup>15</sup>, ὁ πνευματικὸς ἀνακρίνει πάντα. See Edwards *in loco*.

<sup>7</sup> ἀναγγελεῖ.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Jn 3<sup>4</sup>, ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία.

<sup>2</sup> Ro 1<sup>17</sup>, ἐν αὐτῷ (τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ) ἀποκαλύπτεται δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ. For δικαιοσύνη, see Sanday and Headlam *in loco*. The word 'covers the whole range of right action.' 'To the few it was the highest moral ideal,' etc. etc.

<sup>3</sup> Jn 12<sup>31</sup>, νῦν ὁ ἀρχὼν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἐκβληθήσεται ἐξ ὧ.

the work of the Spirit of God, or to measure the effect of His work upon the life of man. It was more than the revelation of truth, for it was also, and more particularly, an indwelling within man of One who was God Himself. To man, unsure of purpose, bewildered by facts of life which seem to involve grave moral contradictions, affronted by the frequent and loudly vaunted triumphs of evil, what could have come with greater power—the power which lies in a full assurance of the reality and of the character of sin, righteousness, and judgment,—what could have come with

greater power than the presence at the very centre of life of a Divine Person, earnest and foretaste of a greater possession still,<sup>1</sup> as by His presence within us we know ourselves the heirs of God.

Great is the life which comes to us by reason of that surrender of ourselves to Christ which we call 'faith.' Great are the issues of that life in joy, in knowledge, in prayer; but greatest of all is He who lives within us, life of our life, the informing Spirit, Spirit of all truth.

<sup>1</sup> Eph 1<sup>14</sup>, ἀρραβὼν τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν. Cf. Ro 8<sup>17</sup>, κληρονόμοι μὲν Θεοῦ συγκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ.

## Literature.

### THE RELIGION OF THE SIKHS.

It is not for their religion that the Sikhs are best known. They are known all over the world for their prowess in battle and for their loyalty. But the fame which they have acquired, and which is so honourable, rests ultimately upon their religion. We may not need to know what their religion is. We may need only to know that we can still rely upon Sikh fidelity if all the other races of India should prove faithless. But until the Sikhs have embraced Christianity and so are bound to Britain by that strongest and most endurable of all ties, it is right and necessary that we should know that it is their adherence to their present religion that keeps them loyal and makes them brave. It is startling to find Mr. Macauliffe advocating the establishment of the religion of the Sikhs in India by the British Government. His argument, however, is quite intelligible. For he fears that, if left to itself, the religion of the Sikhs may be swallowed up in Hinduism. And though it is improbable that the British Government will ever establish a religion again, yet if establishing a religion is likely to keep it in life, there could be found political arguments for the establishing of this one which would appeal even to a statesman like Lord Morley of Blackburn. 'Truly wonderful,' says Mr. Macauliffe, 'are the strength and vitality of Hinduism. It is like the boa-constrictor of the Indian forests. When a petty enemy appears to worry it, it winds round its opponent, crushes it in its folds, and finally causes it to disappear in

its capacious interior. In this way, many centuries ago, Hinduism on its own ground disposed of Buddhism, which was largely a Hindu reformation; in this way, in a prehistoric period, it absorbed the religion of the Scythian invaders of Northern India; in this way it has converted uneducated Islam in India into a semi-paganism; and in this way it is disposing of the reformed and once hopeful religion of Baba Nanak. Hinduism has embraced Sikhism in its folds; the still comparatively young religion is making a vigorous struggle for life, but its ultimate destruction is, it is apprehended, inevitable without State support.'

But would it not be better to lose the loyalty of the Sikhs than to perpetuate their religion? Mr. Macauliffe does not think so. And accordingly he has given the English reader the first complete and competent account of the Sikh religion.

Until 1893, Mr. Max Arthur Macauliffe was engaged in judicial duties in India. In that year he was requested by certain Sikh societies, which were aware of his appreciation of their literature, to resign his appointment and devote himself to a translation of their sacred books. He did so. In course of time he translated the whole; and, as he translated, he submitted each portion to the criticism of certain learned Sikhs. Thus the work appears as the universally accepted and authorized English translation. And this is well. For there is probably not an Englishman living—even Dr. G. A. Grierson would refuse to be called an exception—capable of criticising it. The work



is in six volumes, published under the title of *The Sikh Religion*, at the Clarendon Press in Oxford (63s. net).

About thirty miles south-west of the city of Lahore, the capital of the Panjab, and on the borders of the present civil districts of Gujranwala and Montgomery, stands the town of Talwandi, deep in a lonely forest. It is on the margin of the Bar or raised forest tract which occupies the centre of the Panjab. The town is still girdled by a broad expanse of arborescent vegetation, which, when not whitened by the sand blown by the winds of the desert, wears through all seasons a cheerful appearance. The jal (*Salvadora Persica*) predominates, but there are also found the phulahi (*Acacia modesta*) and the jand (*Prosopis spicigera*). The wild deer is seen occasionally, startled at the traveller who disturbs the solitude of its domain, and the hare and the partridge cower cautiously among the thickets, deprecating molestation.

In this retreat was born Guru Nanak, the founder of the Sikh religion. His birth took place on the third day of the light half of the month of Baisakh (April-May) in the year 1526 of the Vikramaditya era, corresponding to 1469 A.D. The town has now lost its old name, and is known as Nankana, in memory of the religious teacher to whom it had the honour of giving birth. When the Sikh religion had gained prominence, there was a temple erected on the spot where the Guru was born. It was afterwards rebuilt and enlarged by Raja Tej Singh, at the time when the Sikh arms had attained their greatest power and the Sikh commonwealth its greatest expansion. Within the temple is installed the Granth Sahib, or sacred volume of the Sikh faith, intoned by a professional reader. The innermost shrine contains some cheap printed pictures of the great Guru, and musicians beguile the day chanting the religious metrical compositions of the Gurus.

The great Pandits and Brahmans of Hinduism communicated their instructions in Sanskrit, which they deemed the language of the gods. Guru Nanak and his successors thought it would be of more general advantage to present their messages in the dialects of their age. When Guru Amar Das was asked the reason for this, he replied, 'Well-water can only irrigate adjacent land, but rain-water the whole world. On this account the Guru hath composed his hymns in the language

of the people, and enshrined them in the Gurumukhi characters, so that men and women of all castes and classes may read and understand them.'

The Sikhs form a considerable section of the population of the Panjab, and are scattered in greater or less numbers not only throughout the whole of India, but Kabul, Kandahar, China, and Southern Asia. There are two great divisions of Sikhs, Sahijdharis and Singhs. The latter are they who accept the baptism inaugurated by Guru Gobind Singh. All the other Sikhs are called Sahijdharis. The Singhs, after the time of Guru Gobind Singh, were all warriors, the Sahijdharis those who lived at ease, as the word denotes, and practised trade or agriculture.

What, then, is the religion of the Sikhs? Its cardinal principle is the unity of God. On this Guru Nanak took his stand against the abounding idolatry around him. And the unity of God is emphasized and repeated throughout all the Sikh writings. But the personality of God is not so clearly stated. Mr. Macauliffe acknowledges that there are passages in which pantheism is distinctly implied. The difficulty was to avoid anthropomorphism and not fall into pantheism. The other great principle is *nirvana*, or 'absorption in God.' 'Nirvan,' says Mr. Macauliffe, 'from *nir*, "out," and *va*, "to blow," means in Sikh literature the cessation of individual consciousness caused by the blending of the light of the soul with the light of God.' The Sikhs compare it to water blending with water :

As water blends with water, when  
Two streams their waves unite,  
The light of human life doth blend  
With God's celestial light.  
No transmigrations then await  
The weary human soul;  
It hath attained its resting-place,  
Its peaceful crowning goal.

The moral worth of the Sikh religion in a land like India can, in Mr. Macauliffe's judgment, scarcely be overestimated. 'It prohibits idolatry, hypocrisy, caste exclusiveness, the concretion of widows, the immurement of women, the use of wine and other intoxicants, tobacco-smoking, infanticide, slander, pilgrimages to the sacred rivers and tanks of the Hindus; and it inculcates loyalty, gratitude for all favours received,

philanthropy, justice, impartiality, truth, honesty, and all the moral and domestic virtues known to the holiest citizens of any country.'

But what is all this to us? Let us conclude with a last quotation from Mr. Macauliffe's engaging introduction: 'Those who, secure in their own wisdom and infallibility, and dwelling apart from the Indian people, spurn all knowledge of their theological systems, and thus deem Sikhism a heathen religion, and the spiritual happiness and loyalty of its followers negligible items, are men whose triumph shall be short-lived, and whose glory shall not descend with the accompaniment of minstrel raptures to future generations.'

### THE ATONEMENT.

At the University of Chicago Press there has been published a volume of essays on the Atonement. Its title is *Biblical Ideas of Atonement* (\$1 net). For it is not a contribution to Systematic Theology. It is an investigation, according to the historical method, of the ideas expressed in the books of the Bible regarding atonement for sin, and reconciliation with God. The investigation is made as little theological as possible, in order that it may be as historical as possible. But lest theological students should be disappointed with the book, two chapters are added at the end of it on 'The Significance of the Biblical Teachings concerning Atonement' and on 'Atonement in the Light of Modern Thought.' The subject is distributed among three members of the Staff of the University. Professor J. M. P. Smith takes the Old Testament, Professor E. De Witt Burton the Non-Canonical Jewish Literature and the New Testament. The last two chapters already referred to are contributed by Professor G. B. Smith.

What are the conclusions? In the Old Testament there is no uniform persistent doctrine of Atonement. Each new age brought with it new ideas concerning God and sin. And change in these conceptions necessitated corresponding change in the formulation of the idea of atonement. The prevailing idea in the earliest times was that of sacrifice or offering as a compensation to Jehovah for an offence against His majesty and holiness. Closely allied to this view was another which saw in the animal sacrificed a substitute for the man whose guilt was deserving of death.

These views of sacrifice, say the writers, gradually faded out of Israel's consciousness. After the earliest times there is no substitutionary doctrine of Atonement in the Old Testament.

Nor is there any substitutionary doctrine of Atonement in the New Testament. 'The New Testament writers find the significance of Christ's death in its revelation of God's love, in its realization of the ideal of the Suffering Servant of Jehovah, in its fulfilment of the principle of devotion to the interests of mankind, in accordance with which all men ought to live.'

Whether these results are agreeable or disagreeable, they seem to be honestly arrived at. The last chapter is an effort to show how the gospel may continue to be preached without any doctrine of Atonement.

Where the Chicago Professors stop, the Rev. W. L. Walker begins. His volume, which he entitles *The Gospel of Reconciliation* (T. & T. Clark; 5s.), is theological. It is not the history of the idea of atonement that Mr. Walker is interested in; it is its reality and its value. He searches the Bible certainly. He searches it historically. But at every step he stops to consider the significance of what he has gained, and the progress he is making.

And yet the conclusion to which he comes, though richer in content and of more immediate spiritual advantage, does not greatly differ from the conclusion reached by the professors of the University of Chicago. Confining himself to the meaning of the death of Christ, Mr. Walker does not find that it was, in the ordinary meaning of the word, an atonement. What then was it? He sets down its value in two conclusions. First, Christ's whole life was the expression of the holy and loving Spirit of God, the proof of His goodwill toward men and of His gracious purpose for them. Next, Christ's acceptance of the cross for our sakes was the crowning proof of the Divine love that moved in Him towards mankind.

It is therefore an error, says Mr. Walker, to suppose that Divine forgiveness is *grounded* on the cross. God does not forgive because of the cross: the cross came to Christ because God was forgiving men. What the cross of Christ does for us is to restore us to the consciousness of the forgiving love of God, whereby new saving influences are set a-working within the soul.



How entirely all this is out of touch with the old orthodox doctrine of the Atonement may be seen by turning to a small volume by the Rev. J. B. Oldroyd, M.A., Vicar of Brantingham, which contains an account of *The Doctrine of the Atonement chiefly as set forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Elliot Stock; 2s. net).

If Mr. Walker and the Chicago professors rightly represent the teaching of the Bible on atonement, then the modern Jewish doctrine is in the direct line of succession. According to the modern Jewish doctrine there is no atonement. An authoritative and absolutely unmistakable declaration of this occurs in a volume of Jewish sermons and addresses recently published.

The author of the volume is Hermann Gollancz, M.A., D.Lit., Rabbi, Preacher to the Bayswater Synagogue, London, and Goldsmid Professor of Hebrew in the University College of the University of London. It is a volume of extraordinary interest to Gentiles. It is so evidently, inevitably, absorbingly Jewish. When the sermons were preached, or the addresses delivered, it is evident that there was not a Gentile within hearing; it has not once been considered that the book will ever fall into a Gentile's hands. So we have the Jewish atmosphere without any mixture of elements. And it is just such a book as this that enables us to understand where the Jew is now, and where in the future he hopes to be. Its title is simply *Sermons and Addresses* (Unwin Brothers; 10s. 6d. net).

There is much Biblical matter in it. For it is a large book of 664 pages, royal octavo. There are short expositions of the Hardening of the Heart, of Jephthah's Vow, of the Dietary Laws, of the Rainbow, of the Sabbath, the Tabernacle, and the Cherubim. There is much light thrown on the Jewish aspect of modern questions in ethics, and even in politics. There are addresses on preaching, on revivals, and on the interchange of pulpits. And there is never any doubt about the attitude of modern Jews, or at least of this very capable and scholarly modern Jew, on any of the matters considered. But we shall be satisfied at present with a glance at what is said about the Atonement.

There is no atonement. Dr. Gollancz goes back, as we recently saw Rabbi Adler go back, to the offer of Moses in the wilderness to become an

atonement for the people of Israel. That Moses did offer to become an atonement, Dr. Gollancz has no doubt. For, first, he said to the people, 'Ye have sinned a great sin; and now I will go up unto the Lord, peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sin.' And, next, he said to God, 'Oh, this people has sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold: yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin,—and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written.' But he is just as sure that God rejected the atonement. And in the rejection of it, Dr. Gollancz sees a repudiation on God's part of the idea of atonement for ever. Accordingly he says: 'The idea of vicarious atonement, that one man shall bear sin and die for another, or for a whole people, or for a whole world, is, according to the teaching of Judaism, displeasing to Heaven, and directly opposed to the idea of God's justice and mercy.'

But there is another book. Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley has published a volume on *The Jewish Doctrine of Mediation* (Skeffington; 3s. 6d. net). Mediation is not atonement, and Dr. Oesterley does not confound them. But it is so closely allied to atonement that the book may be taken here. And all the more that the author deals directly with the Jewish doctrine of atonement as defined by Dr. Adler and Dr. Gollancz.

Dr. Oesterley goes back with them to the atonement offered by Moses in the wilderness. He says the point is not whether the Lord accepted the offer. The point is that the offer was made. And by whom? 'By Israel's greatest teacher; by the man to whom God revealed the Torah; by the man who, with perhaps the exception of Abraham, is more venerated by Hebrews than any other who has ever lived.' And Dr. Oesterley points out that there is no hint that Moses was wrong in making the offer. Then he recalls the case of Abraham, who made intercession for the city of Sodom, and was answered, 'If I find in Sodom fifty righteous within the city, then will I spare all the place for their sake'—which looks very like the germ of a doctrine of Atonement.

But, as we have said, Dr. Oesterley's book is not directly on the doctrine of the Atonement. It is a very capable and thorough exposition of the Jewish doctrine of Mediation.

### THE DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGION.

There is no study so popular as the study of Religion. And that is chiefly because a new method for the study has been found. It is the psychological method. Psychology is itself, in any systematic form, a new study. It has made so much progress of late that it is now willingly granted the position of a science. And it had scarcely obtained this recognition when it was used to elucidate the facts and explain the phenomena of religion, with results at once surprising and gratifying.

The Rev. George Galloway, M.A., B.D., D.Phil., hitherto known as an accomplished and acute metaphysician, has written a volume on *The Principles of Religious Development* (Macmillan; 10s. net). He has not written or attempted to write a History of the Development of Religion. He has given his attention to the principles which underlie and are disclosed in the development of religion. For he is in lively sympathy with that psychological method which, as we have said, is the present most popular way of studying religion. His purpose, accordingly, is, in a word, to bring the science of psychology to bear on the evidences of religious life in the past and the present, in order to discover the principles by which religion has passed from that state in which it is scarce distinguishable from magic to the faith that is in Christ Jesus.

Now, in the first place, Dr. Galloway is clear that religion is not an accidental or external thing, but that it has 'its roots in human nature.' He is also clear that it did not arise at the beginning from the exercise of a single faculty in man. That was Hume's mistake, repeating the notion of Epicurus and Lucretius, as he traced the religious attitude to the emotion of fear. That was Kant's mistake, as he went to the other side from Hume, eliminated the element of feeling altogether, and connected religion ultimately with the will. That, finally, is the mistake of minor men since Kant, who have declared that man was a religious being simply because he could think.

Dr. Galloway, we say, is a psychologist. The psychologist takes account of all that is left to man after the physiologist has had his share. Religion is due partly to feeling, partly to thinking, partly to willing. And not to each of these separately or in turn, but to the operation of all

these together—in short, to the play of man's psychology. Its origin is due to psychology, though Dr. Galloway says little about its origin, simply because he knows little: especially is its development due to psychology. And so the volume is an exposition, full, patient, powerful, of the place which feeling, thinking, and willing have had in the development of religion, and of the action and interaction of the one upon the other.

### A FEW BOOKS OF DEVOTION.

Begin with the late Principal Marcus Dods. It is a posthumous volume, and there is neither editor nor introduction. There are short meditations on selected topics, with a short prayer at the end of each meditation. The note is sincerity. The thought is robust, and the language appropriate. But both in prayer and in meditation the note is absolute sincerity. The title is *Footsteps in the Path of Life* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.).

From Dr. Dods it is proper to pass to Professor Macewen, his colleague in the New College, Professor Macewen has made a study of *Antoinette Bourignon, Quietist* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). It is the day for it. Antoinette Bourignon will get a hearing to-day such as she has not obtained for a century. And Professor Macewen is the man for it—a scholar who is not afraid to take down folios; a Presbyterian who has added the *Imitatio* to the Shorter Catechism. He is not a Bourignonian. He does for us just what we sent him to do—gathers out all that is good in Bourignonism for this present time, and throws the bad away. Also he shows us that Antoinette Bourignon was better than her Bourignonism.

Before going further, let us recommend a book under whose shadow we have sat down with great delight. The author is Dora Farncomb, of 52 Victor Avenue, Toronto, and the title *The Vision of his Face* (Elliot Stock; 3s. 6d. net). It catches the attention first by the exceeding appropriateness of its quotations. It holds it by its own exceeding spirituality.

Mr. Elliot Stock is also the publisher of *The Christ in Holy Communion*, by the Rev. T. A. Gurney, M.A., LL.B. (1s. net).

Messrs. Longmans have published a new and attractive edition of Archbishop Leighton's *Rules and Instructions for a Holy Life* (2s. net). The editor is the Rev. James Dinwoodie.



Another reprint is Myers' *Saint Paul*, one of Mr. Allenson's 'Heart and Life Booklets' (1s. net). Mr. Allenson has also issued in the same series *A Psalter for Daily Use*, arranged by Professor Knight (1s. net).

A new book by Dr. Andrew Murray is always an event to the lover of devotional literature. It consists of some studies on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Epistle to the Ephesians. Its title is simply *Aids to Devotion* (Nisbet; 1s.).

Here take in a little volume of poems called *Puritan Pansies* (Headley Brothers). The author is Mr. Claud Field.

The Rev. P. Hatley Waddell, D.D., has written a large volume of *Thoughts on Modern Mysticism* (Blackwood; 3s. 6d.). The word 'Thoughts' in the title is more modest than it need be. It is really a systematic description of the philosophical origin and implications of Mysticism. The last chapter but one touches the mysticism in Christian Science.

Last of all comes a book by Dr. James Drummond, entitled *Johannine Thoughts* (Green; 3s. 6d. net). It is partly prose and partly poetry. It is all original, thoughtful, devotional. There are friends of Dr. Drummond who are unwise enough to express 'a poor opinion' of the Fourth Gospel. This shows what it can be to the spiritual life of a man born and brought up to distrust its history and its theology.

#### The Rev. J. O. Bevan.

We had one volume from Mr. Bevan last month. This month we have other two. The first to be noticed is an *Exposition of the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels of the Book of Common Prayer* (George Allen & Sons; 3s. 6d. net). The exposition consists of remarks more in observation than in exposition, with an occasional anecdote. On the words 'they enclosed a great multitude of fishes,' Mr. Bevan says: 'We cannot tell, and it is idle to inquire, whether Omnipotence or Omniscience was most concerned in this miracle, but we cannot fail to recognize the power of Christ as Creator and Sustainer.' The words 'there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth,' he illustrates with this anecdote: 'A distinguished evangelist relates that one afternoon he noticed at the service a young lady whom he knew to be a teacher. At the conclusion of

the service, he asked her where her class was. 'Oh,' said she, 'I went to the school, and found only a little boy—so I came away.' 'Only a little boy?' said the clergyman; 'think of the value of one such soul! The fires of a Reformation may be slumbering in that tow-headed lad! There may be a Wesley, a Whitefield, a Xavier in your class. Never despise the units. Think of souls individually, even as God thinks of them. Christ came down not only to die for the world—to die for all—but to die for all *one by one*; and if there had been but one sinner to be saved, for that sinner would He gladly have died, and gladly have suffered the tortures that He actually endured to save all mankind!'

The other volume is entitled *Egypt and the Egyptians* (George Allen & Sons; 5s. net). It is a sketch of the History, Antiquities, Language, and Religion of the Ancient Egyptians, and their influence over Palestine. Mr. Bevan is not himself either an explorer or a decipherer. But he knows what both the explorer and the decipherer have been doing, and he gives a reliable compact account of their results, down to the very latest spadeful or squeeze.

#### Benedict Spinoza.

The best introduction to philosophy is the introduction to a philosopher. Professor A. Wolf, M.A., D.Lit., of the University of London, introduces us to Spinoza. And his very purpose is to introduce us to the philosophy of Spinoza, and from that to the love of philosophy itself. He has taken the best plan possible. He has translated *Spinoza's Short Treatise on God, Man, and his Well-Being* (A. & C. Black; 7s. 6d. net). He has written an introduction to the Short Treatise, and a commentary on it. He has given a list of the necessary literature. He has prefaced the whole with a life of Spinoza. And he has lightened our labour, if not his own, by the introduction of twelve excellent photographs. The whole is the work of a well-trained mind, whose training has been obtained largely from the long study he has given to this very philosopher. It is an admirable example of the benefit of specializing.

#### The Baptist Historical Society.

The fourth number of the first volume of the *Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society* (Baptist Union; 2s. net) contains an essay by

Dr. W. T. Whitley, on 'Benjamin Stinton and his Baptist Friends, and a Record of his Historical Researches.' The rest of the number contains memorials of the Jacob-Lathorp-Jessey Church, 1616-1641.

The second volume of the *Minutes of the General Assembly of the General Baptist Churches in England* has now been issued. It is edited for the Baptist Historical Society by the Rev. W. T. Whitley, M.A., LL.D., and published at the Kingsgate Press. The minutes are usually brief; sometimes not much more than a record of the sederunt. But when matters are entered upon, they are matters of almost universal interest, they are such matters as occupied the attention of the earliest Christians of all. One question is whether a Baptist should marry outside the Baptist Communion. On this subject one of the ministers sent a letter to the General Assembly of 1744, in which he said, 'The severity contended for, especially as to some persons, is a very great hardship. Marriage has its rise and expedients from our nature and constitution. 'Tis Honourable in all: 'Tis better to marry than to be in pain. Now, since among us in this nation the women are not permitted to Look out for themselves; and when they have no offers from among the men of their own Community, what must they do?'

#### Paradise Lost.

Mr. A. W. Verity and Milton 'belong together,' as they say over the water. Mr. Verity has now gathered his volumes on the separate books of the *Paradise Lost* into one volume, all the notes into one appendix of notes, and all the glossaries into one alphabetical glossary. And now this bulky book is the only edition of the poem worth looking at until one has reached the age for Masson. It is published at the Cambridge University Press (7s. 6d. net).

#### Apostolic Christianity.

Was the Church of England justified in separating from the Church of Rome? Mr. A. W. F. Blunt says it was. And it is justified in remaining separate, because the Church of Rome has not reformed itself. Were the Baptist, the Congregational, and the Methodist Churches justified in separating from the Church of England? Mr. Blunt says they were. But he says they are not justified in remaining separate,

because the Church of England has reformed itself.

The Rev. A. W. F. Blunt, M.A., Vicar of Carrington, sometime Fellow and Classical Lecturer of Exeter College, Oxford, has published a small volume of *Studies in Apostolic Christianity* (Dent; 2s. 6d. net). The studies are historical, but the author is unable to avoid touching upon living and even controversial issues. His spirit, however, is as acceptable as his scholarship is unassailable. And even when he discusses the question of reunion, he avoids offence as much as it is in the power of any man to avoid it who belongs to one branch of the Church and wholeheartedly believes in that branch.

#### The Catholic Who's Who.

The *Catholic Who's Who and Year-Book* is edited by Sir F. C. Burnand (Burns and Oates; 3s. 6d. net). Now the first duty of the editor of a year-book is to include everything that should be included in it while keeping it within bounds. And Sir F. C. Burnand knows that that is the first duty. This is what he says about it: 'In successful Annuals, as in successful men, the tendency in growing years is to become unwieldy in bulk. The publishers have therefore dieted the 1910 issue of the *Catholic Who's Who* by a complete re-setting and re-arrangement of its pages, and by the use of an increased number of abbreviations; the addition of 1200 new biographies leaves the book therefore with the admired slimmness of its first issue.' That does not mean that 1200 new biographies have been added this year, it means 1200 since the first issue. But 500 have been added this year, which makes us wonder what the editor will have to do ten years hence, if his constituency increases at the same pace. A Catholic Who's Who must be more useful, we think, to Protestants than to Catholics. But the use of this Who's Who would be greatly increased if the address were added at the end of each biography.

#### Aristotle.

We hope that the student of Philosophy is aware of the steady issue in English of the works of Aristotle. The newest issue is a translation of the *De Mirabilibus Auscultationibus*, made by Mr. L. D. Dowdall, B.D., LL.B. (Clarendon Press; 2s. net).



### Mount Athos.

The monasteries of Mount Athos are much resorted to for the study of Biblical and Patristic manuscripts. Professor Kirsopp Lake of Leiden is one who has often visited them. And he has not allowed himself to be entirely absorbed in the manuscripts. He has studied the early history of monasticism on the Holy Mountain. *The Early Days of Monasticism on Mount Athos* is the fruit of this study (Clarendon Press; 8s. 6d. net). It is a small volume for so large a price. But there are books that are priceless, and this is one of them. For its information is worth having, and it is not to be had anywhere else. It contains four chapters, and to each chapter there is an appendix of documents.

There are three periods through which Greek monasticism has passed—the hermit period, the period of loose organization of hermits in lauras, and the period in which the laura is replaced by the monastery, with definite buildings and fixed regulations. Professor Lake's volume collects the evidence for the existence, even on Mount Athos, of the hermit and laura periods.

### Sin.

The Rev. W. E. Orchard sent an essay on *Modern Theories of Sin* to the London University examiners for the degree of Doctor of Divinity, and obtained the degree. The essay is an astonishment. Is there any other man who has read so much about sin as Dr. Orchard has read? And is it not a sign of the time that the mere discussion of what sin is should fill so large a book?

Dr. Orchard divides his discussion into three parts and thirteen chapters. The parts are introductory, critical, and constructive. The most enticing chapters are those of the second part, which treat of (1) theories which trace sin to the will of man (Kant, Coleridge, Julius Müller); (2) theories which regard sin as a necessity (Schelling, Weisse, Hegel); (3) theories which seek to explain sin by confining it within the bounds of religion (Schleiermacher, Ritschl); and (4) theories which seek to explain sin from empirical observation (Pfleiderer, Tennant).

Then comes the long quest for a satisfactory working modern theory of sin. And perhaps this may be given as what it arrives at: the conscience, illumined by the revelation of Christ, declares that any condition which falls short of

His standard for the individual or the community is one that ought to be repudiated and cast off.

The book is published by Messrs. James Clarke & Co.

### The Finsbury Library.

Mr. Culley has issued other six volumes of the cheap series of reprints, edited by the Rev. John Telford, B.A., and called 'The Finsbury Library.' Three of the volumes contain a translation of Dante's *Commedia*, a translation not altogether unknown to Dante students, but rarely possessed by them. It is, of course, the work of a Wesleyan Methodist, the Rev. John Wesley Thomas. The preface to the first volume was dated 'Penrith, April 1859.' Cobbett's *Rural Rides* fill other two volumes, and the sixth is *The Early Journal of Charles Wesley* (1s. net each).

### Philosophy and Religion.

Dr. Hastings Rashdall has sent for Messrs. Duckworth's 'Studies in Theology,' the MS. of six lectures delivered at Cambridge on *Philosophy and Religion* (2s. 6d. net). The lecture that has given us most food for thought is the fifth. Its subject is Revelation. What is revelation? As Dr. Rashdall understands it, revelation is discovery. It is made on earth. But it is not made simply by hard thinking. The man who is to obtain any revelation must first of all have an interest in religion. 'If I take no interest in the properties of curves or the square root of  $-1$ , I am not very likely to make a good mathematician. This connection of knowledge with interest applies in an exceptional degree to religious knowledge.' This leads Dr. Rashdall into a definition of faith, and this is the definition: 'Religious faith means the deliberate adoption by an effort of the will, as practically certain for purposes of action and of feeling, of a religious belief which to the intellect is, or may be, merely probable.'

### Crete.

Keep your eye on Crete. The study of studies is Religion. The great revolution in the study of Religion is mightily encouraged by the discoveries in Crete. And Crete is good for the shaking up of the historian also. Minos? The Labyrinth? Ariadne? Yes, says the discoverer, they are all here, found to be historical and ready to revolutionize the study of history. And so, this volume on *Crete, the Forerunner of Greece* (2s. 6d. net), which has been written most capably and most

pleasantly by Charles Henry Hawes, M.A., and Harriet Boyd Hawes, M.A., and added to Harper's 'Library of Living Thought,' will be found as full of wonder as it is of wisdom.

#### The Person and Place of Jesus Christ.

It is not easy to read this large book. After the first hundred pages it has to be laid aside for a time. Yet it must be read to the end.

There is no absence of interest. The difficulty is in the packing of thought. Dr. P. T. Forsyth is mentally most alert, and expects no less mental alertness in his readers. Every sentence has to be read. And every sentence is worth reading.

It is the Congregational Union Lecture for 1909. And it is not less notable as a contribution to the doctrine of the Person of Christ than was the Congregational Union Lecture of Dr. Dale to the doctrine of the Atonement. Perhaps a quoted sentence or two will be the best review.

Take this: 'What, it has been asked in many tones of late, what is the essence of Christianity? The best known answer, that of Harnack, is too meagre. He is too much of a devout historian, and too little of a spiritual thinker. The essence of Christianity is Jesus Christ, the historic Redeemer and Lord and God, dwelling in his Church's faith. I have already said that there never was a time, even in the Church's earliest days, when Christianity was but the reproduction of the personal faith of Jesus, or the effort to live His ethic. It was always a faith in Jesus concentric with the Church's faith in God.'

Again, take this: 'It cannot be too often recalled that the article of Christ's deity is the theological expression of the evangelical experience of his salvation, apart from which it is little less than absurd, and no wonder it is incredible.'

And again this: 'If God produces a special understanding of the fact, He must have produced the fact. If apostles so moved saw in the resurrection of Christ such significance, then the fact itself is not at the mercy of mere historical evidence. The act of faith when it rises to inspiration gives us the reality of its object in giving us its power. If God made men so to read and trust the resurrection power, He could not be misleading them as to the creative fact it streamed from. The same spirit effected both. If inspired knowledge grew out of a certain fact, that fact is a part of God's

revelation. We cannot take the resurrection gospel and leave the resurrection fact.'

The criticism to be made is solely that the book takes so much hard reading. There may seem lack of system, but that discovers itself. Not only so, but it is found that the sentences which seem to be going round and round are really moving forward. It might have been easier for the reader if the order which runs through the book had been more manifest on the surface. But the obliteration of landmarks was no doubt part of Dr. Forsyth's plan, to make us read the book and keep us from picking and choosing among its topics. And, in any case, it is not a theological exposition of the doctrine of Christ's Person that is offered. The title is *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ* (Thomas Law; 10s. 6d.). Not the person only, but also the place. And it is the author's chief desire that Christ should be made to occupy that place in our lives which is His because of the fact and significance of His Person.

#### Old Testament History and Literature.

A manual of Old Testament History recording the results of recent criticism, both historical and literary, has been written by the Rev. B. H. Alford, late Vicar of St. Luke's, Nutford Place, London, and published by Messrs. Longmans (5s. net). Many such manuals have been issued recently, but now the interest is so widespread, the results so assured, and the spiritual and ethical gains so enormous, that many manuals are likely to be issued, and there is room for them all. It is impossible to say whether Mr. Alford means his book to be used in the class-room or read in the home. It is certainly very pleasant to read. We believe it will be just as good to teach.

#### Dr. Maclaren's Expositions.

This great enterprise in the publication of sermons—beaten by Spurgeon's and by none other—is nearing the end. The new volume contains *Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, and 1 Timothy* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d.).

#### Broken Earthenware.

How many of our purely professional men of letters take an interest in the doings of the Salvation Army? Mr. Harold Begbie is one, but we cannot think of another. There is therefore the pleasure of surprise, as well as the joy of thankful-



ness, in the reading of these sketches of typical cases of conversion made by the officers of the Army. The title is *Broken Earthenware* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.)—an artist's title. And Mr. Begbie has found plenty of artistic material in this unpromising field. But art is not everything, and occasionally Mr. Begbie is quite carried away. It is meet that he should make merry and be glad.

#### Macaulay on Jewish Disabilities.

Several of Macaulay's essays have been published separately for use in schools. But we have not seen the essay on Civil Disabilities of the Jews. It has been separately published now, together with the speech which Macaulay delivered in the House of Commons on April 17, 1833. And both speech and essay have been annotated and edited by Mr. Israel Abrahams, M.A., and the Rev. S. Levy, M.A. For the combined study of English and of Ethics, where will a better instrument be found than this volume? The title is *Macaulay on Jewish Disabilities* (Jewish Historical Society).

#### The Bible for Home and School.

The new volumes of the 'Bible for Home and School,' edited by Professor Shailer Mathews of Chicago, are (1) *Genesis*, and (2) *Colossians and Ephesians* (Macmillan; 2s. 6d. each). The editor of *Genesis* is Professor H. G. Mitchell, who is thoroughly acquainted with the issues involved; and as *Genesis* has not yet appeared in the 'Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges,' this commentary should be particularly welcome. One valuable feature is the list of various readings given on every page, from the Septuagint, Vulgate, Syriac, and Targums. Where else can we find these readings conveniently?

The *Colossians and Ephesians* volume is the work of Professor Gross Alexander. It is slightly more conservative than the average volume of this series will be. And that is no fault. For the book is quite up to date in scholarship, and whatever is affirmed as fact may be relied on as capable of affirmation. The notes are clear, incisive, and memorable. But they are not always to be received with thanksgiving. Professor Alexander must reconsider his judgment on the law that was 'taken out of the way.' He says it was only the ceremonial law. So we are in bondage still.

#### Darwinism and Human Life.

Professor J. Arthur Thomson of Aberdeen delivered the South African Lectures in 1909. And as the South African Lectures are delivered at the invitation of the South African Association for the advancement of Science, he inevitably chose Darwinism for his subject. He has now published the lectures under the title of *Darwinism and Human Life* (Melrose; 5s. net).

Professor Arthur Thomson is one of the very few who can make science popular. And he deliberately sets himself to do it. He can make science popular enough even for the preacher. The preacher will find illustrations in his books, reliable and illuminating—the best kind of illustrations. But besides being profitable for the pulpit, the new book, like all Professor Thomson's books, is very good entertainment. Here is a paragraph by the way.

'To keep a famous inland fish-pond from giving out, some boxes of mud and manure were placed at the sides. Bacteria—the minions of all putrefaction—worked in the mud and manure, making food for minute Infusorians, which multiply so rapidly that there may be a million from one in a week's time. A cataract of Infusorians overflowed from box to pond, and the water-fleas and other small fry gathered at the foot of the fall and multiplied exceedingly. Thus the fishes were fed, and, as fish-flesh is said to be good for the brain, we can trace a nexus from mud to clear thinking. What was in the mud became part of the Infusorian, which became part of the Crustacean, which became part of the fish, which became part of the man. And it is thus that the world goes round.'

#### English Church History.

Mr. Burn has been fortunate in getting Dr. Alfred Plummer to undertake a volume of his 'Handbooks of English Church History.' The volume is now issued under the title of *The Church of England in the Eighteenth Century* (Methuen; 2s. 6d. net). There are few Church historians of our day who carry more weight than Dr. Plummer, he is so free from bias and so faithful to fact. Having the gift of imagination, he has it under discipline.

#### Dr. Paul Carus.

Dr. Paul Carus is a very advanced critic of Christianity, but he has no desire to destroy it. He criticises it severely because he loves it dearly.

He would separate the kernel of it from the husk. In his latest book he has gone back to the beginning, and under the title of *The Pleroma* (Open Court Publishing Co.; \$1) has written an essay on the origin of Christianity. The great factor in the rise of Christianity was the faculty of idealization, which the early Christians seem to have possessed in a degree entitling them to the wonder of all the world. The explanation, in fact, simply substitutes one miracle for another. If Jesus was not the miracle which the Gospels declare, it is a greater miracle that the Gospels are able to declare it.

Dr. Carus has issued a synopsis of all his writings under the title of *Philosophy as a Science* (50 cents). The book gets its title from an essay which introduces it. We must not use the words miracle and miraculous lightly. But how shall we express our wonder when we find it takes a book of 200 pages to record little more than the titles of the books and articles which Dr. Carus has written in his lifetime—books and articles of scientific value and on the most difficult of scientific subjects? The volume is introduced by an essay on Philosophy as a Science.

#### The Nicene Creed.

A short and altogether reliable history and exposition of *The Nicene Creed* is sure to find favour, and Dr. A. E. Burn was the man prepared for it. The little volume belongs to the Oxford Church Text-Books (Rivingtons; 1s. net).

#### The Hebrew Genius.

Mr. Leon Simon has edited a volume of essays on Jewish literature and thought, calling it *Aspects of the Hebrew Genius* (Routledge; 2s. 6d.). There are seven essays. Their subjects are Philo, Saadiah, Maimonides, Jewish Codes and Codifiers, Aristotle and Mediaeval Jewish Thought, Jewish Mysticism, and the Jewish New Learning of the Nineteenth Century. There is also an introduction by Mr. E. N. Adler, in which we are told that the volume

covers the whole range of Jewish thought during Christian times; that the essays are independent and may be read in any order, but they had better be read in their order in the book.

Well, what is the Hebrew genius? It is the genius for religion. There are other things that the Jews have done well; this is the only thing that they have done supremely well. Everything else, indeed, obtains its value from the measure of the religion it holds.

#### Against the Real Presence.

It is the doctrine of the Real Presence that divides Christians. And there is no other division worth naming beside this division. The Rev. P. C. Ingrouille, B.D., has studied the doctrine of the Real Presence, and he has written its history and its condemnation in a volume entitled *Our Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving* (Thynne; 3s. net). Mr. Ingrouille understands the issue and is in earnest. But he takes his side as a Christian, not as a politician. He has confidence that the truth itself will find its way to the reader's mind, the two being made to embrace one another. On the whole we do not know a clearer or more convincing statement of the historical argument on the evangelical side.

#### Comparative Religion.

Mr. L. H. Jordan is ever on the watch to further the cause of Comparative Religion—no man more strenuously. He has issued a survey of the literature for the years 1906 to 1909. It is his second survey of the kind. It may be had from Messrs. Otto Schulze of Edinburgh.

#### Public Opinion.

End with a periodical this month, and let the periodical be *Public Opinion*. Yet no description can cover its manifold variety or suggest its invariable excellence. It keeps one in touch with science, politics, and literature: it almost makes newspapers and books indispensable.



## The Pilgrim's Progress.

BY THE REV. JOHN KELMAN, M.A., D.D., EDINBURGH.

### Ignorance.

It is a clever literary stroke which at this point relieves a long conversation—always difficult to sustain with unflagging interest—by an incident. In this second interview with Ignorance, Bunyan unquestionably has in his mind that chapter from the *Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven* entitled 'The Sin and Danger of Ignorance.' As a sample of that exceedingly lively chapter the following page may be quoted:—

*Theologus.* Who was Christ's mother?

*Asunetus.* Mary, sir; that was our blessed lady.

*Theol.* Who was Pontius Pilate?

*Asun.* I am somewhat ignorant, I am not book-learned; but if you will have my simple opinion, I think it was the devil; for none but the devil would put our sweet Saviour to death.

*Theol.* What is the holy catholic church, which you say you do believe?

*Asun.* The communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins.

*Theol.* What do you pray for when you say 'Thy Kingdom come'?

*Asun.* I do pray that God would send us all of His grace, that we may serve Him and do as we ought to do, and keep us in a good mind to Godward, and to have Him much in our minds; for some, God bless us, have nothing but the devil in their mind; they do nothing in God's name.

*Theol.* What is a sacrament?

*Asun.* The Lord's Supper.

*Theol.* How many sacraments be there?

*Asun.* Two.

*Theol.* Which be they?

*Asun.* Bread and wine.

*Theol.* What is the principal end of your coming to receive the sacrament?

*Asun.* To receive my Maker.

*Theol.* What is the principal use of a sacrament?

*Asun.* The body and blood of Christ.

*Theol.* What profit and comfort have you by a sacrament?

*Asun.* In token that Christ died for us.

*Theol.* I can but pity you for your ignorance; for it is exceeding gross and palpable. Your answers

are to no purpose, and bewray a wonderful blindness and senselessness in matters of religion, etc.

It is true that Asunetus differs from Ignorance in his ingeniousness, and yet they have much in common. Neither is ignorant in the sense of general boorishness, for both are in a certain sense well-informed. Yet both are shallow in mental faculty and slender in information. They are well-versed in the language of theology, and have both built out of its current phrases a system satisfactory to themselves. But, like all private systems which are founded upon words rather than upon thoughts and knowledge, there is a continual sense of aloofness from the facts of the case, which is less tolerable in self-made systems than in those at least accredited by historical theology.

Bunyan's Ignorance has been contrasted with the family of Valiant-for-Truth, who lived in Dark-land. Valiant's family were ignorant about facts; Ignorance was ignorant about principles. And it is this that accounts for the elaborate and somewhat bitter treatment which Ignorance receives. There is a moral quality in this man's ignorance, which is difficult to define in any one statement; but, nevertheless, perfectly obvious as we consider the case in detail. The subtle influences that combine to make up this character remind us of Coleridge's happy phrase, 'The impudence of ignorance,' and justify Kerr Bain's remark that here we have 'Obstinate at the other end of the pilgrimage.'

1. The fact which is apparent at the outset is that he likes his own company better than that of others. This is a splendid piece of analysis, and it reveals a quite familiar type of character in every generation. There are men whose greatness makes them solitary, and there are men whose littleness makes them solitary; some whose thoughts are too far-reaching and too deep to be shared with others, and some whose thoughts are so little founded on common knowledge that they at once betray their poverty when brought out into the open. Every one has met with half-educated men who are fascinated with a few fine ideas, held apart from their relations with other ideas, and liable to topple over in conversation. Such men prefer anything to the ordinary honest

labour of study, and imagine themselves heaven-born geniuses, because their intellectual sloth has deprived them of all standards for judging the worth and originality of such ideas. Montaigne has said that 'A dog we know is better company than a man whose language we do not understand'; and such men as Ignorance, understanding no man's language but their own, find every man bad company who has any real grasp of truth.

2. A curious consequence of this solitary habit, and a very significant one, is that Ignorance has had no experiences by the way. We hear nothing of encounters either with enemies like Atheist and Flatterer, or with friends like Evangelist and Faithful. With smooth advance he has gone on and on, till here we find him half-way through the enchanted ground without drowsiness. Travelled men who are self-absorbed have wasted both their money and their time in travel. The love of adventure, the companionable spirit, the quick eye for new impressions, are absolutely indispensable if travel is to do its proper work of educating the mind. In such men the lack of perspective and proportion becomes intensified by chronic neglect of that which should have corrected it, and they become incurably provincial in intellect and imagination.

3. The source of all this evil is the complacency of Ignorance's good opinion of himself and of his heart. Bunyan himself knew something about that. There was, a time when he had said, 'Now I was become godly; now I was become a right honest man' (*Grace Abounding*). But on after reflexion, Bunyan had seen that all this was but the work of those indiscreet neighbours of his—his first models for the picture of Flatterer—who had begun 'to praise, to commend, and to speak well of me, both to my face and behind my back,' upon one of his early reformations. Ignorance is his own Flatterer. And, little dreaming how deeply he was entangled in the nets, he had seen Christian and Hopeful entangled, and thanked God he was not as they. Thus this man's ignorance is centred in ignorance of himself. Instead of knowing himself, he loves himself and believes in himself. His self-examination is accordingly a sorry business. Robert Browning's well-known line is curiously and ironically relevant:

Be love your light and trust your guide, with these explore  
my heart.

But when a man explores his own heart by the

lamp of self-love and under the guidance of trust in himself, the result is strange and pitiful. Three notes sum up this examination, viz. :—

(1) *Comfort*, which is mentioned twice on one page, is his main demand in religion. But comfort never was nor can be the first matter in dealing with Jesus Christ. To those who come only for this, He offers 'not peace but a sword.' Comfort there is indeed in Him, but it is the comfort of the Truth, and before that can be reached there are many discomfiting questions to be settled.

(2) *Desire*, the well-spring of comfort, and the substitute for character in such souls. There is, indeed, a wonderful virtue in desire. 'Rabbi ben Ezra' assures us that

What I aspired to be,  
And was not, comforts me;

and in 'Saul' we have the even bolder assurance that

'Tis not what man Does which exalts him, but what man  
Would do.

Our own Larger Catechism, in still plainer language, asserts that 'One who doubteth of his being in Christ . . . may have true interest in Christ, though he be not yet assured thereof; and in God's account hath it, if he be duly affected with the apprehension of the want of it, and unfeignedly desires to be found in Christ, and to depart from iniquity.' It is easy to see how such views as these may be perverted into the fallacy that 'the desire for grace is grace.' Their truth or falsity depends entirely upon the attitude of the will. Desire, accompanied by strenuous endeavour, counts as attainment whether the endeavour succeed or fail; desire without action is mere sentiment, which may be the worst enemy of character.

(3) *Leaving all*, a phrase which shows that the author had here the rich young ruler in his mind. 'How very hard a thing it is to be a Christian!' But it is not a hard thing to adopt the language of Christianity and to adapt it to one's own moral and emotional conditions. The one outstanding fact about Ignorance is that he has not left all. For Christ's demand is 'Let him deny *himself*,' and Ignorance clings to himself, in an unbounded love and trust. As for other renunciations, such as money, or land, or details of property, or habits that he may have surrendered, they have no value except as parts of the great central renunciation—



the giving up of oneself. It is us, not ours, that Christ asks for and will have.

### The Word of God.

Christian, tired of the constant reference to his own heart upon which Ignorance falls back, insists on bringing all disputed matters to the test of the Divine Word. This was the characteristic fashion of Puritan Theology, and to it the Word of God meant simply the Scriptures.

1. *Regarding thoughts*, especially thoughts about ourselves. Here Christian quotes three texts, two from the Book of Genesis and one from the Epistle to the Romans, to show that there are no good thoughts in man's mind at all except the conviction of this his total depravity. It may be said, and truly, that this is not the complete testimony of Scripture, and that many passages might be found which acknowledge natural virtue in man. And, indeed, the 'proof-text' method is always precarious in this respect; that selections of texts isolated from the context may be constructed so as to prove the most astounding paradoxes. In the case before us, there is an inner witness, and, as Martineau has it, an inner 'seat of authority,' which must inevitably be the final court of appeal, and whose authority is necessarily paramount, over that of both Church and written Scripture. When reformation theology forgot that, it fell into the same error as the Catholicism it opposed, substituting one external authority for another, and doing less than justice to the witness of the Spirit. On the other hand, the validity of such inward witness depends entirely upon the state of mind and character in him who claims it. Ignorance, like Kipling's 'Tomlinson,' is one whose thoughts count for nothing because of his inveterate self-satisfaction and his incurable slightness. It is such thinking as his that made the Psalmist break out into his famous epigram, 'I hate thoughts' (Ps 119<sup>113</sup>). But when a man's spirit is humble and sincere, his desire towards the will of God, and his thoughts therefore deep and worthy, he may trust his judgment, and even when he makes mistakes he need not blame himself too bitterly. The Pope, in *The Ring and the Book*, carries conviction when he says regarding his judgment, that even it should be proved mistaken :

What other should I say than 'God so willed :

Mankind is ignorant, a man am I,

Call ignorance my sorrow, not my sin'?

2. *Regarding ways*, and God's judgment of our ways, the same plan is followed, and a selection of texts made to prove the badness of man's ways apart from grace. This passage owes something to *The Plain Man's Pathway*, and the concluding sentences of it may be compared with this of Theologus, 'If a man could see into their souls as he doth into their bodies, he would stop his nose at the stink of them; for they smell rank of sin in the nostrils of God, His angels, and all good men.'

The language is strong, and the mood severe. But the fact is that to be ignorant is to be dangerous. This light-hearted, feather-headed way of dealing with morals is one of the most dangerous things in the world, both for the man himself and for all with whom he comes in contact. Ignorance does not know what he is talking about when he discourses upon sin and righteousness. He has never been there at all, and the words are but words to him. Sin and righteousness are to him negotiable assets, pawns in the game of life. It is no wonder if those great men the Puritans, whose greatness was founded upon an uncompromising thoroughness in their dealings with moral truth, feeling the awfulness of the danger, were unsparing in their handling of such lightness. The whole passage reminds us of Pascal's saying, that 'There are two kinds of men; the righteous, who believe themselves sinners, and the sinners, who believe themselves righteous.'

### The Faith of Ignorance.

'Do you think,' Ignorance answers to Christian's scathing words, 'that I am such a fool as to think that God can see no further than I?' In what follows he goes on to give an account of the central matter, saving faith in Christ, as he conceived it. How many readers of this passage see at the first hasty glance what is wrong or defective in such faith? Does not the rebuking passage seem fantastic and hair-splitting on matters where an elaborate theological system of doctrine is presupposed? Yet on closer scrutiny the crucial error becomes apparent. The man is willing to admit his sinfulness in general but not in particular, in platitude but not in conscience. Similarly he utters a generality about faith—'I must believe in Christ for justification'—but comes to utter confusion in details. This is the deadliest danger of all shallow natures. Generalities are

cheap, delusive, and worthless. The whole business of the soul is done where it comes to personal and detailed considerations. That is the drift of all Christian's questions, to force him from the general to the particular. In no passage has Mr. J. M. Barrie displayed a truer insight into the heart of Scottish religion than when, in his *Tommy and Grizel*, he shows up the sentimentalist by forcing him up against the direct thought of God.

Two notes to this passage may be of interest.

1. Christian's answer, 'How! Think thou must believe in Christ when thou seest not thy need of Him!'—a sentence which leads us again to *The Plain Man's Pathway* :—

*Theologus*. I see you need no Saviour.

*Asun*. You say not well in that: I need a Saviour, and it is my Lord Jesus that must save me, for He made me.

*Theol*. What! need you a Saviour, since you are no sinner?

*Asun*. Yes, believe me, I am a sinner; we are all sinners; there is no man but he sinneth.

In this quotation, as indeed in the whole extract given at the beginning of this article, we see the same confused dealing with generalities and conventional phrases which is the very mark of Bunyan's Ignorance.

2. It is also interesting to notice that in the end Ignorance falls headlong into Roman Catholic theology. His doctrine of justification is that 'Christ makes my duties, that are religious, acceptable to His Father by virtue of His merits, and so I shall be justified'—a statement in which there is a suggestion not only of the Roman Catholic doctrine of Justification, but of the transference of the merits of saints. Of that doctrine of justification, which is essentially concerned with a man's own good deeds, and not with the free grace of God in Christ, Luther's words on Gal 1<sup>5</sup>, 16, 17 were known to Bunyan, and were doubtless not without their effect on the conversation of Christian here: 'I crucified Christ daily in my monkish life, and blasphemed God through my false faith wherein I then continually lived. Outwardly I was not as other men, extortioners, unjust, whoremongers; but I kept chastity, poverty, and obedience. . . . Notwithstanding in the meantime I fostered under this cloaked holiness and trust in mine own righteousness, continual mistrust, doubtfulness, fear, hatred, and blasphemy against God. And this my righteousness was nothing else but a filthy

puddle, and the very kingdom of the devil. For Satan loveth such saints, and accounteth them his dear darlings who destroy their own bodies and souls and deprive themselves of all the blessings of God's gifts. . . . The more holy we were, the more were we blinded, and the more did we worship the devil.'

Christian's answer to this confession of faith begins with the direct assertion that the faith is fantastical—*i.e.* constructed by fantasy, or fancy, instead of being drawn from and founded on 'the Word.' The argument is really directed against a greater than this poor pilgrim. As we have seen, this faith was constructed by the fantasy of a great Church, which notoriously denied to its members the right of direct access to the Word. In another respect also was Roman Catholic theology fantastical. It was as remote from the actual facts of life and experience as it was from the Scriptures themselves.

Doubtless it is this wider reference that explains the severity of Christian's speech—this, and also his memory of his handling by the Flatterer, who had said in effect the same thing to him as Ignorance. And John Bunyan himself, with his tremendous conviction of sin, and his pitiless far insight into it, had no point in common with a man like this, whose conceit or self-complacency rendered all true sense of sin impossible to him.

These were the days, it may be frankly admitted, when it took some knowledge of theology to make an accredited believer. The theology was complicated and exact, and (as we see plainly from *Cromwell's Letters*) all believers had to be theologians. Nowadays we do not demand, and very few of us could profess, such an elaborately scientific groundwork of theology for our faith. Yet the whole matter is summed up in one distinction, and that is permanent, and as vital to-day as then. The question, in the last analysis, is between self and Christ, works and grace. That is the evangelical crux of faith. It is quite true that 'character is salvation,' and that goodness is goodness all the world over. Yet the fact remains that the more character and goodness we have, the less we are satisfied with it, and the more surely we are driven back on the redeeming love of God in Jesus Christ. For every advance in character only reveals more surely the infinite stretch of moral height and depth. And the more hopelessly we realize this, the more urgently do we feel our need of One to



cast ourselves out on, good and evil alike, that we may lose all, and so find all in His redeeming love. Thus we may still assent to Cheever's exposition: 'Christ will be our only Saviour, or none at all. But there are many who, like Ignorance, profess to rest upon Christ, but make Him only half their Saviour, relying on their own holiness also for acceptance before God. This is a very dangerous error, as in the instance of Ignorance, for it proceeds from self-conceit; and even while under its influence men still think that they hold to the fundamental doctrine of justification by faith. . . . But who does not see that such a faith as this makes Christ not a Saviour of ourselves but of our duties?' Coleridge wrote the satirical label over a collection of tracts advocating such doctrine, 'Redemption made easy; or, Every man his own Saviour.' Kerr Bain wittily says of it, 'He does not profess to make out the £1, but 15s. is tolerably good money, while the 5s., at the least, is systematically furnished by One who has abundance . . . and there is an end of all trouble.' Mason's note on the passage, referring to the question between self or Christ, is, 'Reader, for thy soul's sake, look to thy foundation.'

### Antinomianism.

Ignorance at once seizes on the obvious danger besetting all doctrines of free grace. 'If we are to trust simply in what Christ has done, we shall grow careless as to what we ourselves are doing.' The furious onslaught of Christian is very natural, but is not happy. For once Bunyan's righteous indignation has lost him a chance. For the danger is a real one, and the question is (unfortunately in

the light of many instances) both natural and proper. After all, character *is* salvation, and there is a very real danger in any way of presenting Christianity that would seem even to the most ignorant kind of man to disparage character. There is a popular hymn which contains the lines:

Doing is a deadly thing,  
Doing ends in death.

And Joannes Agricola's Calvinism leads him to the confident assurance that—

I have God's warrant, could I blend  
All hideous sins, as in a cup,  
To drink the mingled venoms up;  
Secure my nature will convert  
The draught to blossoming gladness fast.

It is easy to see how dangerous such ideas may be in ill-balanced natures and untrained consciences. And it was not unnatural, nor in the least degree discreditable, that Ignorance should have found a difficulty here. Christian might have explained, as he was very well qualified to do, how the sense of sin grows with growing character; how compelling is the point of honour to Christ involved in faith, how love is the strongest of all safeguards against temptation. But Christian was tired of Ignorance by this time, and Bunyan was growing impatient. It is not easy to suffer fools gladly, nor to suffer them long. And, after all is said, it takes a bigger mind, and a more sincere conscience, than those of Ignorance to discuss such subjects. Christian, by his direct assault, was trying in a last endeavour to frighten or to anger him into a state of mind wherein he might hope to see plain truths and deal with them.

## Contributions and Comments.

### The Tone of Galatians ii. 1-10.

THESE verses, even as compared with their context, give the impression of having been written under peculiar excitement. It is as if Paul feared that certain historical facts, which he has to recall and admit, put him in the wrong, or at any rate exposed him to be misunderstood. The very fantastic suggestion has been heard of, that v.<sup>3</sup> implies the circumcision of Titus by St. Paul! Assuredly such a 'fact' as that is inconceivable.

But is there not a more obvious explanation of the Apostle's uneasiness? May not the mere act of consulting the Church at Jerusalem have seemed to him, both at the time and in retrospect, like a dangerous compromising of his own independence and of what hung thereon—the freedom of the Gentile gospel? We might conjecture the sequence of events to have been: (1) A proposal made by others, that a deputation should visit Jerusalem (Ac. 15<sup>2</sup>). (2) Refusal on St. Paul's part. (3) Possibly an argument—say, by Barnabas—that the

whole work among the Gentiles might be undermined unless the Jerusalem apostles could be induced to disown the Judaizers (Gal 2<sup>2d</sup>). (4) Paul still unconvinced. (5) A vision which he accepts as a revelation (2<sup>2a</sup>)—God wills it!

It might, however, be held that Paul designedly excludes just such a view as we have in Ac 15—was that view already current?—and asserts that he had not consulted the Church as a Church; only the leaders privately (Gal 2<sup>2c</sup>), and them merely in the interests of his mission-work. In order to avoid terrible risk to his converts—for the Master's sake, and at the Master's command—he imperilled his independence, and acquiesced in the lesser risk, that Jerusalem might seem to have an authority over Gentile churches which it by no means possessed.

I take for granted, in spite of clever writing on the other side, the identity of the visit to Jerusalem in Ac 15 with that in Gal 2. Yet one may hold it more than possible that the 'decree' is misdated in Ac 15, and belongs historically to a later year; cf. Ac 21<sup>25</sup>, when Paul is informed of what 'we have written.'

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

Manchester.

## 2 Thessalonians iii. 14, 15.

WITH a characteristic touch of aloofness, Marcus Aurelius (6<sup>20</sup>) observes that if a man behaves roughly and rudely *ἐν τοῖς γυμνασίοις*, we do not display any exasperation; *καίτοι φυλαττόμεθα, οὐ μέντοι ὡς ἐχθρόν*. We simply avoid him in a dignified way. So in life, he adds, when we meet persons of this temper; *ἔξεστι ἐκκλίνειν καὶ μήτε ὑποπτέειν μήτε ἀπέχθασθαι*. Paul tells the Christians of Thessalonica (2 Th 3<sup>14, 15</sup>) also, if they find any member of the church refractory, *τοῦτον σημειώσθε, μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι αὐτῷ, ἵνα ἐντραπή· καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐχθρόν ἡγείσθε, ἀλλὰ νουθετεῖτε ὡς ἀδελφόν*. The emperor has no room for the motive, *ἵνα ἐντραπή*. He simply gives a negative counsel, which recognizes no duty of remonstrance towards the offender *ὡς ἀδελφόν*. The Stoic individualism and the Christian sense of obligation towards a brother are thrown into sharp contrast by the very similarity of the phrase underlined and of the situation under review.

JAMES MOFFATT.

Broughty Ferry.

## John xi. 43.

WHY, at the grave of Lazarus, did Jesus cry with a loud voice? The word *ἐκραύγασε* is not used elsewhere of our Lord, except negatively in Mt 12<sup>19</sup>, quoting Is 42<sup>2</sup>. Various good reasons are given by commentators, but none I have seen commends itself more than a suggestion by Isho'dad, Bishop of Merv, a Syriac commentator of the ninth century, whose work I am at present editing. I translate the passage thus:

*'He cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth! not that the voice was useful to the dead man, but that the bystanders might know that the Soul was far away from its body, and not inside the grave with it.'*

The Egyptians were accustomed to think of the *Ka*, the principal part of the soul, as haunting the tomb. This superstition was doubtless prevalent amongst all nations that had come under Egyptian influence. That it persisted into Christian times may be seen from a passage in a poetical sermon by Narsai, a Syriac writer of the fifth century, and a pupil of Theodore of Mopsuestia. He describes Joseph, on his way to Egypt as a slave, weeping at the tomb of Rachel and hearing her voice speaking to him. One cannot be quite sure that this same superstition is dead yet. I know a widow lady, an eminent Christian, who was grieved to hear that a manufactory was to be erected at a little distance from the churchyard where the remains of her husband lie, because it would spoil his view! Is it not possible that Isho'dad may be right, and that it was to guard against this natural but heathenish impulse of the human heart, that Jesus cried with a loud voice?

MARGARET D. GIBSON.

P.S.—I see that Matthew Henry has something of the same idea.

## The Cursing of the Fig-Tree.

A DIFFICULTY has always been felt with the Gospel story of the cursing of the barren fig-tree. St. Mark (11<sup>12-14</sup>) records that Jesus being hungry saw a fig-tree with leaves, and went up to it in the hope of finding fruit, but that He found nothing but leaves, 'for,' it is added, 'the time of figs was not yet.' Thereupon He said: 'Let no man hence-



forward ever eat fruit of thee.' St. Matthew's (21<sup>18-20</sup>) account is similar, only that he mentions that it was a solitary fig-tree by the wayside, and that he omits the explanatory clause, 'the time of figs was not yet.'

In both narratives what is in view is unquestionably the so-called 'early or first figs.' The proper harvest season of figs is in the month of August, and these figs are hence called 'summer figs'; but, the fig-tree being as exacting of attention as the olive is the reverse, it very frequently happens that, where this attention has not been paid to it, or where the tree bears too much fruit, many figs do not ripen in August, but afterwards come to maturity in the spring, if the weather conditions are not too unfavourable. Thus it may be said with a measure of truth that the fig-tree bears fruit or, at least, fruit-buds throughout the whole year. This fruit, indeed, is only half ripe at the Passover season, when the incident in question occurred. But in the East even unripe fruit is eaten, and that indeed with special relish. Seeing that the fig-tree was rich in foliage, Jesus might rightly expect to find fruit, although only half ripe, upon it, and thus be able temporarily to satisfy His hunger. Not, indeed, as used to be assumed and as one still hears too often asserted, that the fig-tree bears fruit *before* leaves. Such is not the case, for then the name 'fruit' would be given to fruit-buds the size of a pea or, at most, of a bean. Now, the proper 'time of figs' is in August, so that in this month a leafy tree without fruit-buds, which have their origin in May, is impossible (such is the meaning of the statement, 'the time of figs was not yet'). On the other hand, figs growing out of the buds of the previous year are already ripe in spring, and hence are called 'early figs.' Trees without such, which yet are rich in foliage, may still be met with, although only seldom. Most of the early figs, indeed, drop off while immature, because they are displaced by the summer figs in their progress.

J. BOEHMER.

*Fürstenfelde (Neumark).*

### James ii. 8.

THE ordinary rendering of νόμον βασιλικόν as 'royal law' has never seemed to me to convey a very definite impression; and I do not remember to have seen the suggestion that the words might

be rendered 'the law of the kingdom,' a translation which would be singularly applicable to the phrase of which it is the description, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' It is plain from such a passage as Ac 17<sup>7</sup>, in which St. Paul is charged with preaching 'another king, one Jesus' at Thessalonica, compared with 1 Th 2<sup>12</sup>, 'that calleth you into his own kingdom and glory,' that the teaching of 'the Kingdom of God' played a considerable part in the apostolic message, even in Gentile cities, and to an audience largely Gentile by whom it would not be readily understood: is it not probable that such teaching would be still more prominent in a community of Jewish Christians who would readily understand the meaning, and some of whom might have heard the expression from the lips of the Master Himself? I must leave it to better scholars than myself to decide whether the Greek will bear the rendering; but if it will, the passage seems to me to gain force and clearness.

M. LINTON SMITH.

*The Vicarage, Blundellsands.*

### 'The Sod Bible.'

THE Oxford University Press is renowned for the beauty and accuracy of its Bibles, and that with full right. Yet this time it has added a new specimen to the odd Bibles already produced. In 1717 it produced the 'Vinegar Bible' (Lk 20, 'vinegar' for 'vineyard'); 1801, the 'Murderer Bible' (Jude 16, 'murderers' for 'murmurers'); 1807, the 'Ears to Ear Bible' (Mt 13<sup>43</sup>, 'ears to ear'); 1810, the 'Wife-hater's Bible' (Lk 14<sup>26</sup>, 'wife' for 'life'); and now the 'Sod Bible' (Dt 32<sup>15</sup>, 'SOD' for 'GOD'); see *The Companion Bible*, being the Authorized Version of 1611, with the Structures and Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Suggestive. Part I., The Pentateuch, with 52 Appendices—Henry Frowde: Oxford University Press (no date! but end of 1909).

*Maulbronn.*

EB. NESTLE.

### The First Female Martyr.

STEPHEN has in the Church the *epitheton ornans* πρωτομάρτυρ, the first martyr; see, on the word 'Martyr,' Hastings in his *D.B.*, iii. 278, and on 'Protomartyr,' Suicer's *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus*, ii.

875, 1018. But who was the first female martyr? In one sense we might so call Mary, remembering Lk 2<sup>35</sup>, 'A sword shall pierce through thy own soul also.' But who was the first woman actually put to death for Christ's sake of whom we know? I wonder whether it was not the wife of Peter? At least, Clement of Alexandria (†between 211 and 216) tells in an interesting passage (*Stromata*, vii. 63; iii. 46 in the new edition of Stählin), repeated by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 30. 2):

'Some say, the blessed Peter saw his wife, when she was led to death (ἀγομένην τὴν ἐπὶ θάνατον, Eusebius, ἀπαγομένην τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ), and rejoiced because of her calling and her return to home ἡσθῆναι μὲν τῆς κλήσεως χάριν καὶ τῆς εἰς οἶκον ἀνακομιδῆς), but called her to exhort and comfort her (ἐπιφωνῆσαι δὲ εὖ μάλα προτρεπτικῶς καὶ παρακλητικῶς), naming her by her name (ἐξ ὀνόματος προσειπόντα): O you, remember the Lord (μέμνησο, ὦ αὐτῇ, τοῦ Κυρίου).' Clement adds: 'Such was the married life of the blessed and their perfect behaviour to the most loved' (τοιούτος ἦν ὁ τῶν μακαρίων γάμος καὶ ἡ μέχρι τῶν φιλάτων τελεία διάθεσις). Clement himself is not sure about the story, as he introduces it by φασί, it is told; and it has recently been suggested that he made a slight mistake: the original might have been that Peter saw her (not when she was led to death, but) when he was led this way (ἀγόμενον, not ἀγομένην). Be this as it may, the question is not without interest: Who is the first woman of whom martyrdom is expressly told? EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.



## The 'Vulgate' of Prof. Henslow.

### I.

By the Rev. ALBERT CONDAMIN, S.J., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis.

'THE work is characterized by thoroughness, and is of great exegetical value' (*Dundee Courier*). I am afraid that the reader of the following remarks will have less confidence in the value, either exegetical or otherwise, of the little book of Professor Henslow, *The Vulgate the Source of False Doctrines* (1909), in which he calls for a 'recasting' of the Church's doctrines vitiated, as he says, by the influence of the Vulgate.

1. *Professor Henslow's ideas of the Vulgate are*

*very vague.*—One might doubt that he really understands it to be the work of St. Jerome, were it not that he says: 'The editions of the Vulgate in my possession are entitled as follows: (1) *Biblica* (sic) *Sacra vulgatæ editionis Sixti V.*' (p. vii).

But the work of St. Jerome was completed in 404 A.D., and was adopted only gradually during the succeeding centuries (cf. the excellent article 'Vulgate' by H. J. White, M.A., in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*). How, then, could Professor Henslow make the following statements? 'The knowledge of the Bible in the early centuries of our era was based entirely upon the Vulgate . . .' (p. vi); and especially: 'What has been the consequence of this wrong translation by the Vulgate of μετάνοια? It gave rise to the whole penitential system of Church discipline. It began in the Greek Church, and was followed by the North African and Roman, in which it was dignified as a sacrament. Let us read Tertullian's description of its several elements' (p. 74). How was the Vulgate (finished in 404 A.D.) able to exert an influence, first upon the Greek Church (!), and, *after that*, upon Tertullian, who died about 240 or 245 A.D.?

St. Jerome had translated the Psalms from the Hebrew; but this translation forms no part of the Vulgate, which, for the Psalms, has kept the old Latin version revised by St. Jerome. F. G. Kenyon says very well in a clear and concise article of the new single-volume *Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by J. Hastings: in the Vulgate 'the Canonical Books of the O.T., except the Psalms, were Jerome's fresh translation from the Massoretic Hebrew' (art. 'Vulgate,' p. 960<sup>b</sup>). Professor Henslow does not even seem to suspect this, for, quoting a Psalm, he writes: 'Jerome's translation is said to have been from the Hebrew, but the above seems to show that this passage is from one of the older Latin versions, from the LXX' (p. 20, n. 1). And elsewhere, speaking of Pss 112, 118: 'This shows that the Vulgate was translated from the LXX' (p. 114, n. 1).

2. *Professor Henslow identifies the Vulgate with the 'Index Biblicus.'*—The *Index Biblicus*, published for the first time in 1571 A.D., possesses no official character. The edition of Tournai of 1885 says: 'Indices biblicos, quos omisit cl. Vercellone, quasi intolerabilis tædii laborisque esset eos ut decet corrigere, incredibili labore purgare non



abhorruimus . . .’ Professor Henslow uses an *Index Biblicus* published in 1844, and confounds it with the Vulgate.

‘*Satisfactio*,’ he says, ‘is one of the few ecclesiastical terms which does not occur in the Vulgate . . . In the *Index Biblicus* the reader is referred to *pœnitentia*’ (p. 30; cf. p. 77). But, in reality, *satisfactio* does occur in the Vulgate.

On pages 9 and 10 the author cites a sentence of the *Index Biblicus*, and criticizes the sentence as quoted, saying: ‘The mistake of the Vulgate is twofold,’ and he adds as a proof other passages of the *Index Biblicus*. His reasoning is the same for the word ‘merit.’ He claims that the word is due to the Vulgate, and for proof cites the *Index Biblicus* referring to Psalms in which, as a matter of fact, the Vulgate does not employ the word ‘merit,’ neither *meritum* nor *mereri* (pp. 113–114). *Index Biblicus* is further cited on pages 38, 57, 92, 102, 127.

Elsewhere his argumentation is based on the *marginal notes* of the Rheims version (p. 18; cf. 17, and 21, 22, 23, 24). For him all this is the Vulgate!<sup>1</sup>

3. *Many other chapters are outside the subject* (the book has 18 chapters, in 136 little pages).—Chap. vi. The doctrine of Redemption rejected here does not depend upon the Vulgate, as it was held by the Greek Fathers before the fifth century.<sup>2</sup>

All of chap. vii. (pp. 45–53) is irrelevant; for the Rev. G. Henslow admits that ‘the Greek word is *καταλλαγή*, which is rightly translated *reconciliatio* in the Vulgate’ (p. 46). The whole chapter is against the meaning given to the word *atonement* through Calvin’s influence.

In chap. viii., pages 54–55 do not attack the Vulgate, because, according to the Rev. G. Henslow, ‘this error [“salvation”=“safety from hell”] has prevailed to the present day, whereas salvation from sin means, as the Vulgate indeed translates it, *salus*, i.e. the spiritual health of the soul’ (p. 56).

Neither do pages 56–71 inculcate the Vulgate,

<sup>1</sup> The Vulgate has *not* the words attributed to it, p. 41, n. 3: *detque animam suam in redemptionis pretium pro multis*.

<sup>2</sup> Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Cyril of Jerusalem, etc., hold the doctrine of satisfaction and substitution; see J. Rivièrre, *Le Dogme de la Rédemption*, 1905, chaps. ix., x., xi. (There is an English translation of the book.)

for, in the opinion of Professor Henslow, the great Eucharistic error of the Church is transubstantiation (pp. 60–63, 65, 66, 67, 69–71). But, ‘it is quite clear,’ he affirms, ‘that the idea of transubstantiation included under *Eucharistia* was, from the above, attributable to the word *is* in “This *is* my body”’ (p. 57). But the verb *is* occurs as well in the Greek N.T. as in the Vulgate: *Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου* (Mk 14<sup>22</sup>, Mt 26<sup>26</sup>, Lk 22<sup>19</sup>). The Vulgate, therefore, is not responsible for this great ‘error.’

Chap. ix. (REPENTANCE) treats of the influence of the Vulgate upon the Greek Church before Tertullian! etc. (see above).

Chap. x. The doctrine of Purgatory is founded, the author thinks, on ‘the erroneous idea of a *material* instead of a *metaphorical* meaning of fire’ in 1 Co 3<sup>13–15</sup>; he cites in a note the Greek *οὗτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός*. It is hard to see how the Vulgate is more responsible than the Greek text for the meaning given to the word *fire*.

In chap. xi. (CONFESSION) the Rev. G. Henslow reproaches the Vulgate for using the expression *confessio fidei* in place of *professio fidei*. What significance can this have as regards the sacrament of Penance? especially when he concedes: ‘The Vulgate is right in using *confiteor* and *confessio* in connexion with sin. . . . The doctrinal errors connected with the word arose much later in the history of the Church’ (p. 89).

The following chapters are no stronger because Professor Henslow always forgets to prove his statement: the doctrines ‘have really arisen from erroneous interpretations of the Greek words’ (Preface, p. v). He does not show that *justifico* is a bad translation of *δικαίω* (chap. xii.); nor that *prædestino* renders incorrectly *προορίζω* (chap. xvi.). In chap. xvi. he argues against the interpreters of the Epistle to the Romans (p. 121), *not against the Vulgate*.

The whole chap. xiv. is directed against the explanation of Mt 16<sup>19</sup> and the ‘power of the keys’ as derived from this text,—*not against the Vulgate*.

Chap. xv. acknowledges that *reconciliatio* and ‘regeneration’ [Vulg. *regeneratio*] give the correct meaning of the Greek words. As regards ‘merit’ in the same chapter, see above.

4. *Mistakes in Greek*.—On p. 98 (cf. 141) we read: ‘The verb *ὑπερίδω*, to overlook’ (for *ὑπεροράω*, aor. *ὑπερέιδον*). *Ἐλνθρώσατο* (p. 37), he derives from *ἐλνθρώω* (p. 141).

I give entire the following curious instance of reasoning about a passage from Ps 40 :

'If we now turn to the LXX, we at once see how the words "A body thou wilt fit for me" are obviously inserted :

Sacrifice and offering thou wilt not,  
[But a body thou wilt furnish for me]  
Holocausts also for sin thou askest not for.'

'In the Latin version the translator has changed the future tense into the past: *Hostiam et oblationem noluiste* (sic), *corpus autem aptasti mihi* (A victim and oblation thou hast not wished for, but a body hast thou fitted for me)' (pp. 19, 20).

But (a), the words in brackets are not inserted: either they rest on a text variant (Briggs, *The Book of Psalms*, in 'The International Critical Commentary,' vol. i. p. 355); or they are 'a free interpretation of the original text' (Westcott, on Heb. 10<sup>6</sup>, 3rd ed., p. 310<sup>b</sup>). (b) There is no future in the Greek text, but three aorists ἡθέλησας, κατηρίσω and ἤτησας, as there are three perfects in Hebrew. (c) The future ought to be, according to Professor Henslow's translation, in the second line, but when he quotes the Latin he emphasizes the verb of the first line.

In his discussion on ἰλάσκεσθαι the author would have done well to consult Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 2nd ed., 1903, pp. 224-225 and 124-135.

5. *A remarkable translation from Latin.*—The words of the reference phrase of the *Index Biblicus*, 'Eucharistia sub altera tantum, nimirum panis specie' (the Eucharist under one species (form) only, namely, the species (form) of bread . . .), are taken for a complete sentence and translated, 'The Eucharist [is]<sup>1</sup> without doubt, only bread under another form'!! (p. 57).

6. *A new formula of Anathema.*—'Valde Anathema sit,' 'let him be strongly accursed,' is given as the ending of a decree of the Council of Trent (p. 60). But no Council has ever used the formula 'Valde A. S.' Moreover, the translation is inaccurate, as the word has, long since, lost its original signification, and only means: Let him be excommunicated.

The present remarks are perhaps sufficient, though many others could be added. The reader will appreciate the thoroughness and exegetical power of Professor Henslow!

<sup>1</sup> Brackets are his.

## II.

By Professor GEORGE HENSLOW, M.A., F.G.S.

MR. CONDAMIN has already *twice* noticed my book in *Revue pratique d'Apologétique*; we now get a more detailed account of my *textual* errors. They are easily accounted for (omitting slips and printer's mistakes). I make no pretension whatever to be a Latin, Greek, or Hebrew scholar, nor to know anything of exegesis; but I asked myself, Why are so many doctrinal terms (e.g., 'oblation,' 'satisfaction,' 'propitiation,' etc.) derived from *Latin* and not Greek words, as are 'Church,' 'Ecclesiastical,' and 'Eucharist'? I naturally turned to the Vulgate; and therein I found words which did *not* correspond with the Greek. Thus, will any more expert Greek scholar tell me if μετανοέω conveys the *inherent meaning* of 'punishment' conveyed by *pœnitentia*, and is the Douay Version 'faithfully translated into English out of the authentical Latin,' etc., correct, in writing 'Doe penance: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand' . . . 'I baptize you in water vnto penance'?

Mr. Condamin notes that some of my objections are *not* due to the Vulgate. I never said that *all* of the false doctrines still held were so. Thus, I should like to see 'Salvation' replaced by Wickliff's 'Health,' a correct rendering of the Vulgate *salus*. So, too, 'Atonement' has lost its true meaning of 'At-one-ment' or 'reconciliation' of the sixteenth century.

I thank Mr. Condamin for calling my attention to my *textual* errors; but why does he not make a like attack upon *my exposure of false doctrines*? I have told him by letter that *he dare not do this*; and this present criticism proves I am right. As a proof I appeal to the reviewer in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, who wrote—'It is really a good strong Protestant polemic. . . . Under each doctrinal heading there is very plain statement of the false teaching of the Roman Church, and the reason for it. . . . A simple example is Repentance—v. *pœnitentia*, whence penance and all the agony of hair shirts.'

I will repeat what I wrote to Mr. Condamin, that he suggests a likeness to some art critic, who instead of dealing with the *picture*, finds fault with the *frame*.



## Was the Baptist loyal to Jesus?

WHY did not the Baptist himself follow Jesus? Why, feeling, as he did, the inward sense of sin, did he not follow the Lamb of God? Why, feeling, as he said, his need of being baptized of Christ, did he not seek from Him the baptism of the Holy Ghost and of fire? Why, having preached the advent of the kingdom, was he content to remain without,—less than the least within it? Why did he continue to hold around him a school of those who attached themselves to him in preference to following the greater leader? And why did he continue to administer the ordinance of baptism, and so perpetuate, long after both he and Jesus had passed away, a Baptist communion which knew only the baptism of repentance and had not so much as heard of the Holy Ghost?

It has been suggested by Dr. Lambert (in Hastings's *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, vol. i. p. 865<sup>a</sup>) that John was perfectly loyal to Christ in all this, but felt that there was still need for a work of preparation, and room, therefore, for a discipleship to the Forerunner. And, indeed, one can well understand that a work like John's could not be finished all of a sudden, and that energies like John's could not sink back into inaction. No doubt, too, it would take time to effect the transference of his followers to Jesus; time, too, for the work of Jesus to attain to the same proportions, and to bulk as largely in the public eye, as John's.

But the question still remains: Why could not the work of John have gone on *within* the circle of Christ's influence and under the shadow of His authority? Had Jesus no preparatory work to do which John could have done for Him? Are we not expressly told that in the beginning, at least, the message of Jesus was precisely that of John—'Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand'? And was it not the best way to arrest that work, and to keep it still only in the preparatory stage, for John himself to remain apart? Did he not thus form a different, and as we actually see a rival, centre, and so prevent, by the entering in of a spirit of jealousy and contention, the further transference of his adherents to the following of Jesus?

For my part, I cannot satisfy myself that John was wholly true to Jesus and to His mission. And I find in his doubting question sent to Jesus from

the dungeon (Mt 11<sup>8</sup>) the natural outcome of his great mistake. And in the answer of Jesus I find this view confirmed: 'Go and show John the things which ye do hear and see,' said Jesus to the deputation. And then He enumerated the things which they were to tell their master. What were these things? *Precisely the things which John would have seen for himself had he been of the company of Jesus.* This answer, indicating simply what John could have seen for himself, and no other answer to his question, was vouchsafed by Jesus.

JAS. B. RUSSELL.

Aberdeen.

## John xii. 32-36.

THE usual way of explaining the words of Jn 12<sup>35</sup>, 'Yet a little while is the light among you,' seems to be to make the reference to the Teacher so soon to be 'lifted up.' The previous conversation suggests another interpretation. The people have asked the meaning of the Christ 'who abideth for ever.' Jesus had said, 'The Son of man (namely, Himself) must be lifted up.' But, ask the people, what is the meaning of that Son of man, spoken of in the law, who does not die, but abides for ever, *i.e.* on earth? Dods and McClymont make the answer evasive. 'Don't trouble with these sophistries. Rather turn to the divine truth seeking you in My teaching.' But may not the reference well be to that 'light which lighteth every man coming into the world,' of John's Prologue? The people have asked for an explanation of the Son of man who abides in the world for ever. The direct answer is 'That Son of man is the principle of light in the race. For a little while the Light is *in you* (*ἐν ὑμῖν*, *8BDKL*). Take the inspiration of your highest moments—when that inward divine light illuminates your soul, follow its leading that ye may indeed become 'children of light.' For the ethical application introduced in the reply of Jesus one may compare the first verse of Matthew Arnold's poem 'Morality':

We cannot kindle when we will  
The fire which in the heart resides;  
The spirit bloweth and is still,  
In mystery our soul abides.  
But tasks in hours of insight willed  
Can be through hours of gloom fulfilled.'

H. BULCOCK.

Droylsden.



## Entre Nous.

### Sixty Years with the Bible.

PROFESSOR W. N. CLARKE has written his autobiography. It is a history of his interest in the Bible. Whether things happened to him, or were done by him, not recorded here, we cannot tell. It seems as through Professor Clarke had lived his life with the Bible. *Sixty Years with the Bible* is his autobiography (T. & T. Clark; 4s. 6d. net).

Is he a Bibliolater, then? He is not a Bibliolater. His autobiography is a record of emancipation. He began with a doctrine of inspiration which did not admit the very possibility of contradiction in the Bible itself or between the Bible and any other true thing. He ended with a full acceptance of the historical method of its study.

His autobiography is a history of Bible study during the last sixty years. It is personal enough, but the personal in it is thoroughly representative. Only in one respect is it singular, that he has been so faithful. As soon as he saw the light he walked in it.

The influences were partly from without, partly from within. Of the outward influences, he refers to certain men without naming them. He refers also to Scrivener's *New Testament*, to Meyer's Commentaries, to *Essays and Reviews*, to Herbert Spencer's *First Principles*. Regarding the inward, he tells a most fascinating story of his discovery of the doctrine of the Atonement when he was forty years of age.

Here is a thing he did in the early days of his ministry: 'I asked my people to read the Bible through with me in a year, three chapters a day and five on Sunday, and promised them help from the pulpit as the reading went on. A good number accepted the invitation, and though some fell out by the way, Bible reading was a prominent feature in the life of the congregation in that year. I accompanied it with a course of Bible sermons, as I called them, each treating of a book in the Bible, or of a group of books.'

Perhaps the discovery which impressed him most was the discovery that the Canon of the Bible is not yet closed. Let him tell it: 'One Sunday evening there strolled in to hear me a pair of scientists with whom I had a slight acquaintance, one of them rather eminent in his generation.

Afterward I wondered what they thought. I do not remember what my text was, but it was one of the condensed expressions of truth that abound in the First Epistle of St. John. I spoke of this Epistle as later in origin than the book that stands at the close of the Bible, and as occupying a place at the very end of the long course of divine revelation. I appealed to its testimony as the last and highest word, the ripened fruit of God's great revealing process, the very climax of that which has come from Him to His world of men. I spoke, in fact, as if nothing had been heard from God since that Epistle was written. I did not know at the time how far away I was putting God from His world. But the retributive power did not overlook me. After a while a wave of remembrance swept over me, to my humiliation, and I wondered what my scientific acquaintances thought that I, a Christian minister, believed about the living God. If they believed in God at all, as I think they did, they believed in a God who did not close His work of self-expression and betake himself to silence eighteen hundred years ago, but who "worketh hitherto," a God self-uttering as the light; and I had been addressing them as if God had been silent to men through all these ages. I wish I might have the opportunity of preaching to them now; but one of them is gone to the other life, and the other I shall never meet.'

In one place, near the end, he tells how it came about that he had to write and wrote the book which made him famous (he does not say it made him famous), his *Outline of Christian Theology*. 'In the next three years I rewrote my treatise three times, enlarging it each time. In the fourth year I rewrote it again, and printed it. A few years later I revised and enlarged it once more, and it was published.'

### Point and Illustration.

A book on *Labrador: The Country and the People* (Macmillan; 10s. net) may seem an unlikely quarry for the preacher, unless he remembers that the Moravians are there, or discovers that the writer of the book is Dr. Wilfred Grenfell. Wilfred T. Grenfell, C.M.G., M.R.C.S., M.D., (Oxon.), is the writer of the greater part of the book,



but there are chapters by other men in it—a chapter on the geology by Mr. Reginald A. Daly; a chapter on the Indians by Mr. Williams B. Cabot; chapters on the birds, the flora, the insects, by other men; and a chapter on the marine crustacea by a lady, Mary J. Rathbun. Every chapter, in short, is the work of an expert. And the full-page illustrations, which are many, are the work of an expert in photography. Therefore, if we do find illustrations in this book, we shall know that they are both original and reliable. Here are some of them.

#### Six Days shalt Thou Labour.

Canadian fishing vessels visiting Labrador from the lower provinces, are fewer than twenty years ago. Americans from Maine are more numerous. These, the finest fishing vessels by far that come amongst us, are always welcome. Their crews are a generous, open-handed crowd of men, thorough fishermen, and splendidly fitted out. Our own humble vessels look poor and sorry beside them. Only for one thing do we regret their advent, and that is due to their indifference to what we consider the laws of God. They go fishing and working on Sundays among our people, who, though poorer and far more needy of material wealth, are wise enough to know that life does not consist in the abundance of things man possesses. The joy of life on our coast comes of a peace of mind due to a real faith in God's Fatherhood and our sonship, and from every high ideal realized on that premise. Without any theories it is the simplest 'simple life.' There is no room in Labrador for persons affected with the 'dementia of owning things.' If ever by elimination of their faith, or by the introduction of the 'habits of civilization,' our people are deprived of that faith, life would be little short of a purgatory to be endured. So strongly do our people feel on this matter of keeping Sunday strictly for rest, that one of our laws runs that 'no person shall, between the hours of twelve o'clock on Saturday night and twelve o'clock on Sunday night, take or catch in any manner whatsoever, any herring, caplin, squid, or any other bait fish, or set or put out any contrivance whatsoever for taking them,'—just such a law as prevailed one hundred years ago about salmon-catching in Ireland. Oddly enough the law does not prevent catching the cod them-

selves, so we cannot prevent the long lines being hauled by our cousins from 'civilization.' When remonstrated with, however, they have almost always shown enough good feeling to give way to the wishes and customs of our people.

#### No Policemen.

Thousands of our fishermen are absolute abstainers on principle, and a very strong anti-liquor sentiment prevails almost universally. The results are obvious in the fact that we have not one policeman stationed along the whole coast; not one among twenty-five thousand. We have no penitentiary, and there has not been, to my knowledge, a conviction for drunkenness. During sixteen years I have personally not seen one fisherman drunk. It is very different among the North Sea fishermen. Alcohol has there been the downfall of some of the best men. It has cost the lives of more than one of my own friends. It has ruined and starved many families I have known and loved.

A careful study of the health conditions of the coast by the doctors of our staff all these years has shown that there is no need for liquor whatever in these subarctic climates; that, on the contrary, the first man to go down in hard physical conditions is almost always the drinking man. Among men on the sea the dangers from its use are enormously enhanced. As a method of making money, I can conceive of few that are so despicable, so inhuman, as this liquor traffic!

#### A Moravian Missionary.

The missionary in charge at present is a splendid specimen of humanity, broad and strong far beyond the average man, with merry blue eyes, and the abundant light hair of a Viking. He has a capacity for work, and an accuracy of mind rarely equalled. His hospitality and generous manner toward strangers, along with all his other splendid qualities, make him the ideal man for the environment. One could imagine that he had dropped off an ancient 'war swan,' and had persisted ever since those days on these seemingly God-forsaken rocks. The man's scorn of physical conditions, the hard things that he has moulded to his will, and the absolute happiness he always seems to enjoy, have shown to me, each time I have visited the station, how man, as God would have him be, towers above his circumstances. One leaves the station regretting that so few



should be there to benefit, humbled and glad that men of such type still live to adorn the human race.

#### Looking after strayed Presbyterians.

The Rev. Donald Matheson, who is doing most successful work in Oxford in connexion with Presbyterian undergraduates, is credited, says the *Christian World*, with a pleasant wit. At a University reception, the Archbishop of York, who is an old schoolfellow of Mr. Matheson, introduced him to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and while the three were chatting together, Dr. Lang asked Mr. Matheson, 'What are you doing now in Oxford?' 'Oh,' replied Mr. Matheson, 'just looking after strayed Presbyterians.'

#### A Higher Critic.

It was in a Scotch schoolroom, where a class was being examined in Scripture knowledge by H.M. Inspector. 'Can any boy or girl here tell me how Noah would be likely to use his time while in the ark?' asked the Inspector. There was silence for some time, but at length one boy timidly showed his hand, and, on being asked what he thought, replied, 'Please, sir, he wad fish.' 'Well, yes, he might,' admitted the Inspector. Presently another little fellow was seen to wave his hand excitedly, and on being asked to speak, said, 'Please, he couldna fish verra lang.' 'What makes you think so, my little man?' asked the Inspector. 'Because there were only twa worms.'

#### The Mother.

*The Atlantic Monthly*, Feb. 1910.

You struggled blindly for my soul  
And wept for me such bitter tears,  
That through your faith my faith grew whole  
And fearless of the coming years.

For in the path of doubt and dread  
You would not let me walk alone,  
But prayed the prayers I left unsaid  
And sought the God I did disown.

You gave to me no word of blame,  
But wrapped me in your love's belief,  
Dear love, that burnt my sin like flame,  
And left me worthy of your grief.

HESTER I. RADFORD.

#### The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustrations this month have been found by the Rev. J. Rose, M.A., Glenbervie, and the Rev. W. J. Grant, B.A., Katoomba, N.S. Wales, to whom copies of Scott's *Pauline Epistles* and of Dykes's *Divine Worker* will be sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for May must be received by the 1st of April. The text is Rev 21<sup>27</sup>.

The Great Text for June is Rev 22<sup>3, 4</sup>—'And there shall be no curse any more; and the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be therein: and his servants shall do him service; and they shall see his face; and his name shall be on their foreheads.' A copy of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or Downer's *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit*, or Leckie's *Authority in Religion*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for July is Rev 22<sup>14</sup>—'Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have the right to come to the tree of life, and may enter in by the gates into the city.' A copy of Walker's *The Spirit and the Incarnation*, or Downer's *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit*, or Oswald Dykes's *Christian Minister and his Duties*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for August is Rev 22<sup>17</sup>—'And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And he that heareth, let him say, Come. And he that is athirst, let him come: he that will, let him take the water of life freely.' A copy of Gordon's *Early Traditions of Genesis*, or of Scott's *Pauline Epistles*, or of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for September is Ps 1<sup>3</sup>—'And he shall be like a tree planted by the streams of water, that bringeth forth its fruit in its season, whose leaf also doth not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.' A copy of Clarke's *Sixty Years with the Bible*, or Adams's *Israel's Ideal*, or Downer's *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit*, will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.